Random Number Conversion and LOCC Conversion via Restricted Storage

Wataru Kumagai, Masahito Hayashi *Senior Member, IEEE.*

arXiv:1401.3781v3 [quant-ph] 6 Oct 2014

Abstract

We consider random number conversion (RNC) through random number storage with restricted size. We clarify the relation between the performance of RNC and the size of storage in the framework of first- and second-order asymptotics, and derive their rate regions. Then, we show that the results for RNC with restricted storage recover those for conventional RNC without storage in the limit of storage size. To treat RNC via restricted storage, we introduce a new kind of probability distributions named generalized Rayleigh-normal distributions. Using the generalized Rayleigh-normal distributions, we can describe the second-order asymptotic behaviour of RNC via restricted storage in a unified manner. As an application to quantum information theory, we analyze LOCC conversion via entanglement storage with restricted size. Moreover, we derive the optimal LOCC compression rate under a constraint of conversion accuracy.

Index Terms

Random number conversion, LOCC conversion, Compression rate, Entanglement, Second-order asymptotics, Generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution.

I. Introduction

Random number conversion (RNC) is a fundamental topic in information theory [21], and its asymptotic behavior has been well studied in the context of not only the first-order asymptotics but also the second-order asymptotics [7], [17], [12]. The second-order analysis for the random number conversion is remarkable in the following sense. The second-order coefficients cannot be characterized by use of the normal distribution in the case of random number conversion although all of second-order coefficients except for random number conversion are given by use of the normal distribution. To characterize the second-order coefficients in the random number conversion, the previous paper [12] introduced Rayleigh-normal distributions as a new family of distribution. This new family of distribution leads us to a new frontier of second order analysis, which is completely different from existing analysis of the second coefficients. In this paper, we focus on a realistic situation, in which one uses this conversion via a storage with a limited size, like a hard disk. In this case, first, initial random numbers are converted to other random numbers in a storage with a limited size, which is called *random number storage* or simply storage. Second, the random numbers in the storage are converted to some desired random numbers. When the size of media for the conversion is limited, it is natural to consider the trade-off between the sizes of target random numbers and the storage.

In this paper, we consider this problem when the initial and the target random random variables are given as multiple copies of respective finite random variables. That is, the initial random variables are subject to the n-fold independent and identical distribution (i.i.d.) of a distribution P with finite support and the target random variables are subject to the m-fold i.i.d. of another distribution Q with finite support. In the problem, since there is a freedom of the required number of copies of Q in the target distribution, we have to take care of the trade-off among three factors, the accuracy of the conversion, the size of the storage, and the required number of copies of Q in the output distribution. For simplicity, we fix the accuracy of the conversion, and investigate the trade-off between the size of the storage and the required number of copies of Q in the output distribution. We call this problem RNC via restricted storage. In

W. Kumagai is with Faculty of Engineering, Kanagawa University. e-mail: kumagai@kanagawa-u.ac.jp
M. Hayashi is with Nagoya University and National University of Singapore. e-mail: masahito@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp



Fig. 1. Random number conversion via restricted storage.

particular, when $Q = P$, this problem can be regarded as random number compression to the given random number storage.

One of our main purposes is to derive the maximum conversion rate when the rate of storage size is properly limited. If the size of storage is small, the maximum number of copies of target distribution should also be small since the conversion has to once pass through the small storage. Thus, the allowable size of storage closely relates with the conversion rate of RNC via restricted storage.In this paper, we particularly investigate the region of achievable rate pairs for the size of storage and the number of copies of target distribution in the first- and the second-order settings. To clarify which rate pairs are truly important in the rate region, we introduce the relations named "better" and "simulate" between two rate pairs, and based on these two relations, we define the admissibility of rate pairs. Although admissible rate pairs are only a part of the boundary of the region, those characterize the whole of the rate region, and hence, are of special importance in the rate region.

Here, remember that the second coefficients of the random number conversion are characterized by Rayleigh-normal distribution [12]. Since the second-order asymptotic behaviour of other typical information tasks is often described by the standard normal distribution, the characterization by such non-normal distribution is a remarkable feature. To treat the second-order asymptotics of our problem, we introduce a new kind of probability distribution named generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution as an extension of Rayleigh-normal distribution. The generalized Rayleigh-normal distributions are a family of probability distributions with two parameters and include the Rayleigh-normal in [12] as the limit case. Using the generalized Rayleigh-normal distributions, we can characterize the second-order rate region of RNC with restricted storage in a unified manner

We also consider LOCC conversion for pure entangled states in quantum information theory. The asymptotic behavior of LOCC conversion has been intensively studied [2], [3], [5], [9], [6], [8], [12]. However, unlike conventional settings of LOCC conversion, we assume that LOCC conversion passes through quantum system to store entangled states named *entanglement storage*. In the setting, an initial i.i.d. pure entangled state is once transformed into the entanglement storage with smaller dimension by LOCC and then transformed again to approximate a target i.i.d. pure state by LOCC. In particular, when the target pure entangled state is the same as the original pure entangled state, this problem can be regarded as LOCC compression of entangled states into the given entanglement storage. Since the storage to keep the entangled states is implemented with a limited resources, the analysis for LOCC compression is expected to be useful to store entanglement in small quantum system. Since LOCC convertibility between pure entangled states can be translated to majorization relation between two probability distributions consisting of the squared Schmidt coefficients of the states [15], [22], we focus on the relation between majorization conversion and deterministic conversion which describes RNC to analyze the asymptotic behavior of LOCC conversion. Then, it is shown that the performance of majorization conversion and deterministic conversion asymptotically coincide with each other as similar to the results of conventional RNC shown in [12].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function as a function defined by an optimization problem. Then we show its basic properties used in the asymptotics of RNC via restricted storage. In Section III, we formulate random number conversion

(RNC) via restricted storage by two kinds of approximate conversion methods and give their relations in non-asymptotic setting. In Section IV, we proceed to asymptotic analysis for RNC via restricted storage. Then, we show the relation between the rates of the maximum conversion number and storage size and draw various rate regions in both frameworks of first and second-order asymptotic theory. In Section V, we see that conventional RNC without storage can be regarded as RNC via restricted storage with infinite size. In Section VI, we consider LOCC conversion via entanglement storage for quantum pure states. Using the results for RNC, we derive the asymptotic performance of optimal LOCC conversion. In particular, optimal LOCC compression rate is derived in the second-order asymptotics. In Section VII, we give technical details of proofs of theorems, propositions and lemmas. In Section VIII, we state the conclusion of the paper.

II. Generalized Rayleigh-Normal Distribution

In this section, we introduce a new two-parameter probability distribution family on R which contains the Rayleigh-normal distribution introduced in [12]. A function Z on $\mathbb{R}$ is generally called a cumulative distribution function if Z is right continuous, monotonically increasing and satisfies $\lim_{x\to-\infty} Z(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x\to\infty} Z(x) = 1$. Then, there uniquely exists a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}$ whose cumulative distribution coincides with Z. That is, given a cumulative distribution function in the above sense, it determines a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}$. To define the new probability distribution family, we give its cumulative distribution function.

For $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let $\Phi_{\mu,v}$ and $N_{\mu,v}$ be the cumulative distribution function and the probability density function of the normal distribution with the mean μ and the variance v. We denote $\Phi_{0,1}$ and $N_{0,1}$ simply by Φ and N. To generalize Rayleigh-normal distribution, we employ the continuous fidelity (or the Bhattacharyya coefficient) for probability density functions p and q on $\mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}(p,q) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \sqrt{p(x)q(x)}dx. \tag{1}$$

Then, we generalize the Rayleigh-normal distribution defined in [12] as follows.

Definition 1: For $v > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$, a generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function $Z_{v,s}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$Z_{v,s}(\mu) = 1 - \sup_{A\in\mathcal{A}_s} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right)^2, \tag{2}$$

where the set $\mathcal{A}_s$ of functions $A : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_s = \left\{ A \middle| \begin{array}{l} \textit{continuously differentiable monotone} \\ \textit{increasing},\ A(s) = 1,\ \Phi \le A \le 1 \end{array} \right\}.$$

The generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function is proven to be a cumulative distribution function later, and thus, it determines a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}$. From the definition, it can be easily verified that the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function has the monotonicity as $Z_{v,s} \ge Z_{v,s'}$ for $s < s'$. We further remark that Rayleigh-normal distribution function Z_v is defined by (2) with $s = \infty$ in [12], and thus, the following equation holds

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} Z_{v,s}(\mu) = \inf_{s\in\mathbb{R}} Z_{v,s}(\mu) = Z_v(\mu). \tag{3}$$

In this sense, the family of generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function $Z_{v,s}$ includes Rayleigh-normal distribution functions as its limiting case.

To give an explicit form of the Rayleigh-normal distribution functions, we prepare three lemmas.

Lemma 2: When $0 < v < 1$, the equation with respect to x

$$\frac{1-\Phi(x)}{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(x)} = \frac{N(x)}{N_{\mu,v}(x)} \tag{4}$$

has the unique solution $\beta_{\mu,v,s}$ and it satisfies

$$\beta_{\mu,v,s} < \min\{s, \frac{\mu}{1-v}\}. \tag{5}$$

Lemma 3: When $v = 1$ and $\mu > 0$, the equation (4) with respect to x has the unique solution $\beta_{\mu,v,s} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 4: When $v > 1$, the equation with respect to x

$$\frac{\Phi(x)}{\Phi_{\mu,v}(x)} = \frac{N(x)}{N_{\mu,v}(x)} \tag{6}$$

has the unique solution $\alpha_{\mu,v} \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, for $s > \Phi^{-1}_{\mu,v}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$, the equation (4) with respect to x has two solutions and only the larger solution $\beta_{\mu,v,s}$ is larger than $\alpha_{\mu,v}$.

Then, the family of generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution functions is represented as follows.

Theorem 5: The following equations hold: when $0 < v < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &Z_{v,s}(\mu) = \\ &1 - (\sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})} + I_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s}))^2; \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

when $v = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &Z_{1,s}(\mu) = \\ &\begin{cases} \Phi(\mu - s) \\ \quad if \quad \mu \le 0 \\ 1 - (\sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta_{\mu,1,s})}\sqrt{\Phi(s-\mu) - \Phi(\beta_{\mu,1,s} - \mu)} \\ \quad\quad + \Phi\left(\beta_{\mu,1,s} - \frac{\mu}{2}\right) e^{-\frac{\mu^2}{8}})^2 \\ \quad if \quad \mu > 0; \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

when $v > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &Z_{v,s}(\mu) = \\ &\begin{cases} 1 - \Phi_{\mu,v}(s) \\ \quad if \quad s \le \Phi^{-1}_{\mu,v}(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}) \\ 1 - (\sqrt{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})} + I_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s}) - I_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v}) \\ \quad\quad + \sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})})^2 \\ \quad if \quad s > \Phi^{-1}_{\mu,v}(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}), \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where

$$I_{\mu,v}(x) := \sqrt{\frac{2\sqrt{v}}{1+v}} e^{-\frac{\mu^2}{4(1+v)}} \Phi_{\frac{\mu}{1+v}, \frac{2v}{1+v}}(x), \tag{10}$$

$$I_{\mu,v}(\infty) := \lim_{x\to\infty} I_{\mu,v}(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2\sqrt{v}}{1+v}} e^{-\frac{\mu^2}{4(1+v)}}. \tag{11}$$

Theorem 5 is proven in Subsection VII-F by using lemmas in Subsections VII-D and VII-E.

Using the explicit form in Theorem 5, we can prove the following basic property of the Rayleigh-normal distribution function.

Proposition 6: The generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function $Z_{v,s}$ is a cumulative distribution function for $0 < v < \infty$.

Proposition 6 is proven in Subsection VII-G.



Fig. 2. The black, purple, green, blue and red lines represent the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution functions with parameter $s = -0.5,\ 0,\ 0.5,\ 1$ and ∞ at $v = 1/3$.

Next we show the concrete forms of the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function in the limiting cases.

Proposition 7:

$$\lim_{v\to 0} Z_{v,s}(\mu) = \begin{cases} \Phi(\mu) & if \quad \mu < s \\ \frac{1}{2}(1+\Phi(\mu)) & if \quad \mu = s \\ 1 & if \quad \mu > s \end{cases}$$

Proposition 7 is proven in Subsection VII-H. The function itself in Proposition 7 is not right continuous, and thus, not a cumulative distribution function. However, redefining the function value by 1 only at $\mu = s$, the function in Proposition 7 becomes right continuous, and thus a cumulative distribution function. Nevertheless, we define the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution with $v = 0$ as a left-continuous function as follows to describe the asymptotics of RNC via restricted storage later:

$$Z_{0,s}(\mu) := \begin{cases} \Phi(\mu) & if \quad \mu \le s \\ 1 & if \quad \mu > s. \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Proposition 8:

$$\lim_{v\to\infty} Z_{v,\sqrt{v}s}(\sqrt{v}\mu) = \Phi(\mu - \min\{s, 0\}) \tag{13}$$

Proposition 8 is proven in Subsection VII-I.

The graphs of the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution functions can be plotted as in Figs. 2 and 3.

III. Non-Asymptotics for Random Number Conversion via Restricted Storage

We introduce two kinds of approximate conversion methods called deterministic conversions and majorization conversions. Then, to analyze the performance of random number conversion via restricted storage for the conversions, we define the maximum convertible number of copies of target distribution under constrains for storage size and accuracy.

A. Deterministic Conversion

In this subsection, as is illustrated in Fig. 1, we consider approximate conversion problems when the conversion is routed through a storage with limited size N.



Fig. 3. The black, purple, green, blue and red lines represent the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution functions with $v = 0$, $1/3$, 1 and 3 at $s = 0.5$.

First of all, we introduce a deterministic conversion. For a probability distribution P on a finite set $\mathcal{X}$ and a map $W : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$, we define the probability distribution $W(P)$ on $\mathcal{Y}$ by

$$W(P)(y) := \sum_{x \in W^{-1}(x')} P(x). \tag{14}$$

That is, $W(P)$ is the distribution transformed by the deterministic conversion W.

In order to treat the quality of conversion, we introduce the fidelity (or the Bhattacharyya coefficient) F between two probability distributions over the same discrete set $\mathcal{Y}$ as

$$F(Q, Q') := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{Q(y)}\sqrt{Q'(y)}. \tag{15}$$

This value F represents how close two probability distributions are and relates to the Hellinger distance d_H as $d_H(\cdot,\cdot) = \sqrt{1 - F(\cdot,\cdot)}$ [20]. Then, we define the maximal fidelity $F^{\mathcal{D}}$ from P on $\mathcal{X}$ to Q on $\mathcal{Y}$ among deterministic conversions by

$$F^{\mathcal{D}}(P \to Q) := \sup\{F(W(P), Q) | W : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}\}. \tag{16}$$

Moreover, when the size of the storage is limited, the maximal fidelity via restricted storage with size of N bits is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &F^{\mathcal{D}}(P \to Q|N) \\ &:= \sup\left\{ F(W' \circ W(P), Q) \,\middle|\, W : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{B}_N, W' : \mathcal{B}_N \to \mathcal{Y} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_N$ is the space $\{0,1\}^N$ of N-bits, or generally, an arbitrary set whose cardinality is 2^N.

When the confidence coefficient $0 < \nu < 1$ is fixed, we define the maximal convertible number L of copies of Q via a deterministic conversion with the initial distribution P as

$$L^{\mathcal{D}}(P, Q|\nu) := \max\{L | F(W(P), Q^L) \geq \nu, W : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}^L\}.$$

Moreover, when the size of the storage is limited, the maximum conversion number from P to Q via a restricted storage with size of N bits is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &L^{\mathcal{D}}(P, Q|\nu, N) \\ &:= \max\left\{ L \,\middle|\, \begin{array}{l} W : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{B}_N, W' : \mathcal{B}_N \to \mathcal{Y}, \\ F(W' \circ W(P), Q^L) \geq \nu \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the above values can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} L^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu) &= \max\{L|F^{\mathcal{D}}(P\to Q^L)\geq\nu\}, \\ L^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu,N) &= \max\{L|F^{\mathcal{D}}(P\to Q^L|N)\geq\nu\}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, when the source distribution is n-fold i.i.d. of P, we define

$$\begin{aligned} L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu) &:= L^{\mathcal{D}}(P^n,Q|\nu), \\ L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu,N) &:= L^{\mathcal{D}}(P^n,Q|\nu,N). \end{aligned}$$

One of main issues of this paper is the asymptotic expansion of $L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu,N)$ up to the order $\sqrt{n}$.

B. Majorization Conversion

In order to relax the condition for conversion, we introduce the concept of majorization. This relaxed condition is useful for our proof of the converse part. This generalization is essential required for entanglement conversion in quantum information. For a probability distribution P on a finite set, let $P^{\downarrow}$ be a sequence $\{P_i^{\downarrow}\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ and $P_i^{\downarrow}$ is the i-th element of $\{P(x)\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$ sorted in decreasing order for $1\leq i\leq|\mathcal{X}|$. When probability distributions P and Q satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{l}P_i^{\downarrow}\leq\sum_{i=1}^{l}Q_i^{\downarrow}$ for any l, it is said that P is majorized by Q and written as $P\prec Q$. Here, note that the probability spaces of P and Q do not necessarily coincide with each other. The majorization relation is a partial order on a set of probability distributions over a finite set [1], [13]. For an example, for a probability distribution P on a finite set $\mathcal{X}$ and a map $W:\mathcal{X}\to\mathcal{Y}$, we have the majorization relation $P\prec W(P)$. For another example, we denote the uniform distribution over a l-element set by U_l. When the support size of a probability distribution P is l at most, we have $U_l\prec P$. When $P\prec P'$, we say that P can be converted to P' in the sense of majorization conversion. That is, in the majorization conversion, P can be converted to P' when $P\prec P'$.

Then, we introduce the maximal fidelity among the majorization conversions as

$$F^{\mathcal{M}}(P\to Q):=\sup_{P'}\{F(P',Q)|P\prec P'\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})\} \tag{17}$$

where P and Q are probability distribution on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, respectively, and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ is the set of all probability distributions on $\mathcal{Y}$. Moreover, when the size of the storage is limited, the maximal fidelity via restricted storage with size of N bits is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & F^{\mathcal{M}}(P\to Q|N) \\ := & \sup\left\{F(P'',Q)\middle|\ P\prec P'\prec P'',P'\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}_N)\ \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, it obviously satisfies

$$F^{\mathcal{M}}(P\to Q|N)\leq\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{2^N}Q_i^{\downarrow}}. \tag{18}$$

by the monotonicity of the fidelity.

Similar to the deterministic conversion, when confidence coefficient $0<\nu<1$ is fixed, we define the maximum conversion number L of Q^L which can be approximated from P by majorization conversions as

$$L^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu,N) = \max\{L|F^{\mathcal{M}}(P\to Q^L|N)\geq\nu\}.$$

Moreover, when the size of the storage is limited, the maximum conversion number from P to Q via restricted storage with size of N bits is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &L^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu,N) \\ &:= \max\left\{ L \left| \begin{array}{l} P \prec P' \prec P'', P' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}_N), \\ F(P'',Q) \ge \nu \end{array} \right. \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the above values can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} L^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu) &= \max\{L|F^{\mathcal{M}}(P \to Q^L) \ge \nu\}, \\ L^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu,N) &= \max\{L|F^{\mathcal{M}}(P \to Q^L|N) \ge \nu\}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

In particular, when the source distribution is n-fold i.i.d. of P, we define

$$\begin{aligned} L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu) &:= L^{\mathcal{M}}(P^n,Q|\nu), \\ L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu,N) &:= L^{\mathcal{M}}(P^n,Q|\nu,N). \end{aligned}$$

One of main issues of this paper is the asymptotic expansion of $L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu,N)$ up to the order $\sqrt{n}$. This quantity plays an important role in quantum information theory.

C. Basic Properties of Conversions

To begin with, we summarize some properties about maximum fidelity of deterministic and majorization conversion. Since $P \prec W(P)$ for a map $W : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$, we have the relations

$$F^{\mathcal{D}}(P \to Q) \le F^{\mathcal{M}}(P \to Q), \tag{20}$$

$$F^{\mathcal{D}}(P \to Q|N) \le F^{\mathcal{M}}(P \to Q|N). \tag{21}$$

The following lemmas hold for the uniform distribution U_N in the non-asymptotic settings.

Lemma 9: [12] For a probability distribution P and a natural number N, let a distribution $\mathcal{C}_N(P)$ be defined on a finite set $\mathcal{X}$ as follows

$$\mathcal{C}_N(P)(j) := \begin{cases} P^{\downarrow}(j) & \text{if} \quad 1 \le j \le J_{P,N} \\ \frac{\sum_{i=J_{P,N}+1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} P^{\downarrow}(i)}{N - J_{P,N}} & \text{if} \, J_{P,N}+1 \le j \le N \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where $|\mathcal{X}|$ represents the cardinality of the set $\mathcal{X}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &J_{P,N} \\ &:= \max\{0\} \cup \left\{ 1 \le j \le N-1 \left| \frac{\sum_{i=j+1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} P^{\downarrow}(i)}{N-j} < P^{\downarrow}(j) \right. \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Then, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &F^{\mathcal{M}}(P \to U_N) = F^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{C}_N(P), U_N) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_{P,N}} \sqrt{P^{\downarrow}(j)} + \sqrt{(N - J_{P,N}) \sum_{i=j}^{|\mathcal{X}|} P^{\downarrow}(i)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 10: For probability distributions P and Q on a finite set and a natural number N,

$$F^{\mathcal{M}}(P \to Q|N) = F^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{C}_{2^N}(P) \to Q) \tag{24}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{2^N}(P)$ was defined in (22).
We provide the proof of Lemma 10 in Section VII-J. Note that $\mathcal{C}_N(P)$ depends on the source distribution P and does not on the target distribution Q in Lemma 10. This fact is essential in the asymptotics for $F^{\mathcal{M}}(P \to Q|N)$.

Next, we summarize some properties about the maximum convertible number of two conversion. From (20) and (21), we have

$$L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu) \geq L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu), \tag{25}$$
$$L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu,N) \geq L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu,N). \tag{26}$$

One of main issues of this paper is to derive the asymptotic behaviors of $L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu,N)$ and $L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu,N)$ as stated above. Fortunately, when either the source distribution P or the target distribution Q is a uniform distribution, their asymptotic behaviors are evaluated by direct conversions without storage in the following way.

Proposition 11:

$$L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(U_N,Q|\nu,m\log N) \geq L_{\min\{n,m\}}^{\mathcal{D}}(U_N,Q|\nu), \tag{27}$$
$$L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N,Q|\nu,m\log N) = L_{\min\{n,m\}}^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N,Q|\nu), \tag{28}$$

where $\log$ indicate the logarithm to the base 2.

Proposition 12: Let $i = \mathcal{D}$ or $\mathcal{M}$. When $m \geq L_n^i(P,U_N|\nu)$,

$$L_n^i(P,U_N|\nu,m\log N) = L_n^i(P,U_N|\nu). \tag{29}$$

Otherwise,

$$m \leq L_n^i(P,U_N|\nu,m\log N) \leq m - 2\log_N \nu. \tag{30}$$

We provide the proofs of Lemmas 11 and 12 in Appendices VII-K and VII-L, respectively.

IV. Asymptotics for Random Number Conversion via Restricted Storage

When the number of copies of an initial distribution is n, we consider the relation of the size S_n of storage and the number T_n of copies of a target distribution in this section.

Definition 13: A sequence $\{(S_n,T_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is called *ν-achievable* with respect to the deterministic conversion or the majorization conversion if it satisfies

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} F^i(P^n \to Q^{T_n}|S_n) \geq \nu \tag{31}$$

for $i = \mathcal{D}$ or $\mathcal{M}$, respectively.
For a sequence $\{(S_n,T_n)\}$, smaller S_n and larger T_n give a better performance. Hence, we say that a ν-achievable sequence $\{(S_n,T_n)\}$ is *better* than another one $\{(S'_n,T'_n)\}$ when there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S_n \leq S'_n$ and $T_n \geq T'_n$ for $n \geq N$. Similarly, we say that a ν-achievable sequence $\{(S_n,T_n)\}$ *simulates* another one $\{(S'_n,T'_n)\}$ when there exists a sequence $\{a_n\} \subset (0,1]$ such that $(S'_n,T'_n) = (S_{a_n n}, T_{a_n n})$.

When a ν-achievable sequence $\{(S_n,T_n)\}$ is better than a sequence $\{(S'_n,T'_n)\}$, the sequence $\{(S'_n,T'_n)\}$ is also ν-achievable obviously. Moreover, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 14: When a ν-achievable sequence $\{(S_n,T_n)\}$ simulates a sequence $\{(S'_n,T'_n)\}$, the sequence $\{(S'_n,T'_n)\}$ is also ν-achievable.
We provide the proof of Lemma 14 in Section VII-M.

A. First-Order Rate Region

In this subsection, let a sequence $\{(S_n, T_n)\}$ be represented by $S_n = s_1 n + o(n)$ and $T_n = t_1 n + o(n)$ with the first-order rates s_1 and t_1 and we focus on the first-order asymptotics of RNC via restricted storage in terms of s_1 and t_1. Then, we omit the $o(n)$ term since it does not affect any result in this subsection.

Definition 15: A first-order rate pair (s_1, t_1) is called *ν-achievable* when a sequence $\{(s_1 n, t_1 n)\}$ is ν-achievable. The set of ν-achievable rate pairs for $i = \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is denoted by

$$\mathcal{R}^{1,i}_{P,Q}(\nu) := \left\{ (s_1, t_1) \left| \liminf_{n\to\infty} F^i(P^n \to Q^{t_1 n} | s_1 n) \geq \nu \right. \right\}. \tag{32}$$

Then, we have the following characterization.

Theorem 16: For $\nu \in (0,1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{R}^{1,\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q}(\nu) = \mathcal{R}^{1,\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q}(\nu) \\ =& \left\{ (s_1, t_1) \left| 0 < s_1, 0 < t_1 \leq \frac{\min\{H(P), s_1\}}{H(Q)} \right. \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $H(P)$ and $H(Q)$ are the Shanon entropy of P and Q, respectively.

We give the proof of Theorem 16 in Section VII-N. From Theorem 16, $\mathcal{R}^{1,\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q}(\nu)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{1,\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q}(\nu)$ coincide with each other and do not depend on $\nu \in (0,1)$. In the following, we denote the rate regions by $\mathcal{R}^1_{P,Q}$ simply.

Similar to the ν-achievability, we define that (s_1, t_1) is better than or simulates (s_1', t_1') by the relation between the sequences $\{(s_1 n + o(n), t_1 n + o(n))\}$ and $\{(s_1' n + o(n), t_1' n + o(n))\}$. Then, (s_1, t_1) is better than (s_1', t_1') if and only if $s_1 \leq s_1'$ and $t_1 \geq t_1'$. Similarly, (s_1, t_1) simulates (s_1', t_1') if and only if $s_1'/s_1 = t_1'/t_1 \leq 1$.

Definition 17: When $(s_1, t_1) \in \mathcal{R}^1_{P,Q}$ does not have any better achievable rate pair except for itself, the rate pair is called semi-admissible. Moreover, when no other rate pair is better than or simulates $(s_1, t_1) \in \mathcal{R}^1_{P,Q}$ except for itself, the rate pair is called admissible.

We obtain the following corollary by Theorem 16.

Corollary 18: The set of semi-admissible rate pairs is given by

$$\left\{ \left(s_1, \frac{s_1}{H(Q)} \right) \middle| 0 < s_1 \leq H(P) \right\} \tag{34}$$

and $(H(P), H(P)/H(Q))$ is the unique admissible rate pair.

The rate region is illustrated as Fig. 4. Then, the set of semi-admissible rate pairs are illustrated as the line with the slope $H(Q)^{-1}$ and the admissible rate pair is dotted at the tip of the line. In later discussion, we separately treat the problem according to whether an semi-admissible rate pair is the admissible rate pair or not.

B. Second-Order Rate Region

In this subsection, we fix a first-order rate pair (s_1, t_1) of each sequence $\{(S_n, T_n)\}$ and assume it to be ν-achievable. Let the sequence (S_n, T_n) be represented by $S_n = s_1 n + s_2 \sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n})$ and $T_n = t_1 n + t_2 \sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n})$ with second-order rates s_2 and t_2. Then we focus on the second-order asymptotics of RNC via restricted storage in terms of s_2 and t_2. Then, we omit the $o(\sqrt{n})$ term unless otherwise noted.

Definition 19: A second-order rate pair (s_2, t_2) is called *ν-achievable* when a sequence $\{(s_1 n + s_2\sqrt{n}, t_1 n + t_2\sqrt{n})\}$ is ν-achievable. The set of ν-achievable rate pairs for $i = \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is denoted by

$$\mathcal{R}^{2,i}_{P,Q}(s_1, t_1, \nu) := \left\{ (s_2, t_2) \left| F^i_{P,Q,s_1,t_1,s_2}(t_2) \geq \nu \right. \right\},$$



Fig. 4. The first-order rate region $\mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{1,\mathcal{D}}(\nu)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{1,\mathcal{M}}$. The thick line corresponds to the semi-admissible rate pairs.

where

$$\begin{aligned} & F^i_{P,Q,s_1,t_1,s_2}(t_2) \\ := & \liminf_{n\to\infty} F^i\left(P^n \to Q^{t_1 n + t_2\sqrt{n}} | s_1 n + s_2\sqrt{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

If the first-order rate pair is not semi-admissible, the second-order rate region is trivially the empty set or the whole of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Thus, we assume that the first-order rate pair is semi-admissible in the following.

Lemma 20: Let P and Q be arbitrary probability distributions on finite sets. Then, there is a function $F_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2} : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ that is continuous and strictly monotonically decreasing on $F^{-1}_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}((0,1))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} F_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2) &= F^{\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2) \\ &= F^{\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2) \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

for any $t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 20 is derived from Theorems 25, 26, 27 and 28 in the later subsections. From the above lemma, we easily obtain the asymptotic expansions of the maximal convertible numbers.

Theorem 21: Let P and Q be arbitrary probability distributions on finite sets. For arbitrary $s_1 > 0$, $s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(P,Q|\nu, s_1 n + s_2\sqrt{n}) \cong L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P,Q|\nu, s_1 n + s_2\sqrt{n}) \\ \cong & \frac{\min\{H(P), s_1\}}{H(Q)} n + F^{-1}_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(\nu)\sqrt{n}, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where $\cong$ means that the difference between the right-hand side and the left-hand side of $\cong$ is $o(\sqrt{n})$.

Theorem 21 is derived as follows. When we expand as $L_n^i(P,Q|\nu, s_1 n + s_2\sqrt{n}) = t_1 n + t_2\sqrt{n}$ for $i = \mathcal{D}$ or $\mathcal{M}$, the first order rate t_1 is determined by Lemma 16 as $t_1 = \frac{\min\{H(P),s_1\}}{H(Q)}$. Moreover, since the second order rate t_2 satisfies $F_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2) = \nu$ from the definition of t_2, we have Theorem 21.

Moreover, Theorem 21 implies the following theorem about the second-order rate regions.

Theorem 22: Let P and Q be arbitrary probability distributions on finite sets. For $0 < s_1 \le H(P)$, $s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu \in (0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q}\left(s_1, \frac{s_1}{H(Q)}, \nu\right) = \mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q}\left(s_1, \frac{s_1}{H(Q)}, \nu\right) \\ = & \left\{(s_2,t_2) \middle| t_2 \le F^{-1}_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(\nu)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define that (s_2, t_2) is better than or simulates (s_2', t_2') by the relation between the sequences $\{(s_1 n + s_2\sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n}), t_1 n + t_2\sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n}))\}$ and $\{(s_1 n + s_2'\sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n}), t_1 n + t_2'\sqrt{n} + o(\sqrt{n}))\}$. Then, (s_2, t_2) is better than (s_2', t_2') if and only if $s_2 \leq s_2'$ and $t_2 \geq t_2'$. In addition, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 23: A ν-achievable rate pair (s_2, t_2) simulates another one (s_2', t_2') if and only if $s_2 \geq s_2'$ and

$$t_2' = t_2 + \frac{t_1}{s_1}(s_2' - s_2). \tag{37}$$

We provide the proof of Lemma 23 in Section VII-O.

Definition 24: Let (s_2, t_2) be a ν-achievable second-order rate pair. When (s_2, t_2) does not have any better ν-achievable rate pair except for itself, the rate pair is called semi-admissible. Moreover, when no other ν-achievable rate pair is better than or simulates (s_2, t_2), the rate pair is called admissible.

In the following subsections, we separately derive the concrete forms of second-order rate regions and determine the set of semi-admissible and admissible rate pairs for the non-dmissible and the admissible first-order rate pair.

C. Second-Order Asymptotics: Non-Admissible Case

We derive the second-order rate region in the following. We say that a second-order rate pair (s_2, t_2) is (s_1, t_1, ν)-*achievable* by deterministic conversions or majorization conversions when $(s_2, t_2) \in \mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{2,\mathcal{D}}(s_1, t_1, \nu)$ or $\mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{2,\mathcal{M}}(s_1, t_1, \nu)$.

Theorem 25: When (s_1, t_1) is semi-admissible but not admissible, the function

$$F_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2) = \sqrt{\Phi\left(\sqrt{\frac{H(Q)}{V(Q)s_1}}(s_2 - H(Q)t_2)\right)} \tag{38}$$

is continuous and strictly monotonically decreasing on $F_{P,Q,s_1,t_1,s_2}^{-1}((0,1))$ and satisfies (35), where

$$V(Q) := \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} Q(x)(-\log Q(x) - H(Q))^2. \tag{39}$$

We give the proof of Theorem 25 in Section VII-P. When (s_1, t_1) is semi-admissible but not admissible, from Theorems 22 and 25, the second-order rate region is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{2,\mathcal{D}}(s_1, t_1, \nu) = \mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{2,\mathcal{M}}(s_1, t_1, \nu)\\ &= \left\{(s_2, t_2)\,\middle|\, t_2 \leq \frac{s_2}{H(Q)} - \sqrt{\frac{V(Q)s_1}{H(Q)^3}}\Phi^{-1}(\nu^2)\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

In particular, the set of admissible rate pairs is represented by

$$\left\{\left(s_2, \frac{s_2}{H(Q)} - \sqrt{\frac{V(Q)s_1}{H(Q)^3}}\Phi^{-1}(\nu^2)\right)\,\middle|\, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}\right\}. \tag{41}$$

In this case, there is no admissible rate pair. The second-order rate region is illustrated as Fig. 5 and the boundary of the region is the set of semi-admissible rate pairs from Lemma 23.



Fig. 5. The second-order rate region $\mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{2,\mathcal{D}}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{2,\mathcal{M}}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ when a first-order rate pair (s_1,t_1) is semi-admissible but not admissible.



Fig. 6. The relation between permissible accuracy and second-order rate of the number of copies of a target distribution.

D. Second-Order Asymptotics: Admissible Case

The remaining problem is to identify the second-order rate region at the admissible rate pair. Hence, we fix as $s_1 = H(P)$ and $t_1 = \frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}$ and denote as

$$F_{P,Q,s_2}^{i}(t_2) := F_{P,Q,H(P),\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)},s_2}^{i}(t_2), \tag{42}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{2,i}(\nu) := \mathcal{R}_{P,Q}^{2,i}\left(H(P),\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)},\nu\right) \tag{43}$$

for $i = \mathcal{D}$ or $\mathcal{M}$ in the following subsections.

First, we treat the case when both P and Q are non-uniform distributions. Here, we introduce two values as

$$C_{P,Q} := \frac{H(P)}{V(P)}\left(\frac{H(Q)}{V(Q)}\right)^{-1}, \tag{44}$$

$$D_{P,Q} := \frac{H(Q)}{\sqrt{V(P)}}. \tag{45}$$

Then, the optimal accuracy $F_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2)$ is charcterized by the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function as follows.



Fig. 7. The second-order rate region $\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ when (s_1,t_1) is an admissible first-order rate pair and both P and Q are uniform with $C_{P,Q}<1$.

Theorem 26: When P and Q are non-uniform distributions, the following equation holds:

$$F_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2)=\sqrt{1-Z_{C_{P,Q},\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}}(t_2D_{P,Q})} \tag{46}$$

To obtain Theorem 26, it is enough to show the direct part

$$F^{\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2) \ \geq \ \sqrt{1-Z_{C_{P,Q},\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}}(t_2D_{P,Q})}, \tag{47}$$

and the converse part

$$F^{\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2) \ \leq \ \sqrt{1-Z_{C_{P,Q},\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}}(t_2D_{P,Q})}. \tag{48}$$

by (21). We prove Thoerem 26 by showing (47) and (48) in SubsectionsVII-Q and VII-R. Then we obtain the second-order rate region by Theorems 22 and 26. Moreover, since the explicit value of the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function in (46) is given in Theorem 5, we can determine the concrete form of the second-order rate region. The second-order rate region is illustrated as Figs. 8 and 7 for $C_{P,Q}<1$ and $C_{P,Q}\geq 1$, respecttively.

When $C_{P,Q}<1$, there is no semi-admissible rate pair and and the boundary of the rate region represents the set of admissible rate pairs. When $C_{P,Q}\geq 1$, the straight line in the boundary represents semi-admissible rate pairs from Lemma 23 and the curved line does admissible rate pairs.

When either P or Q is the uniform distribution U_l with size l, the asymptotics is reduced to the problem of resolvability or intrinsic randomness, and the second-order rate regions are obtained as follows.

Theorem 27: When $P=U_l$ and Q is a non-uniform distribution, the following equation holds:

$$F_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2)=\sqrt{\Phi\left(\sqrt{\frac{H(Q)}{V(Q)\log l}}(\min\{s_2,0\}-H(Q)t_2)\right)}. \tag{49}$$

In particular, the above value is described by the limit of the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function as follows:

$$F_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2)=\lim_{P\to U_l}\sqrt{1-Z_{C_{P,Q},\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}}(t_2D_{P,Q})}.$$



Fig. 8. The second-order rate region $\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ when (s_1,t_1) is an admissible first-order rate pair and both P and Q are uniform with $C_{P,Q}\geq 1$. The boundary of the region is straight line on the left side of a threshold value $s_{2,P,Q}$. In particular, $\frac{Z_1^{-1}(1-\nu^2)}{D_{P,Q}}=\frac{\sqrt{-8V(P)\ln\nu}}{H(Q)}$ and $s_{2,P,Q}=\sqrt{V(P)}\Phi^{-1}(\nu^2)$ when $C_{P,Q}=1$.



Fig. 9. The second-order rate region $\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{D}}_{U_l,Q}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{M}}_{U_l,Q}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ when (s_1,t_1) is an admissible first-order rate pair.

We give the proof of Lemma 27 in Section VII-S. When $P=U_l$ and (s_1,t_1) is the admissible rate pair $(\log l,\frac{\log l}{H(Q)})$, from Theorem 22 and Lemma 27, the second-order rate region is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{R}^2_{U_l,Q}(\nu)\\ &=\left\{(s_2,t_2)\,\middle|\,t_2\leq\frac{\min\{s_2,0\}}{H(Q)}-\sqrt{\frac{V(Q)\log l}{H(Q)^3}}\Phi^{-1}(\nu^2)\right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{50}$$

The second-order rate region is illustrated as Fig. 9. Then the line with the slope $H(Q)^{-1}$ is the set of semi-admissible rate pairs from Lemma 23 and the extreme point is the unique admissible pair.

Theorem 28: When P is a non-uniform distribution and $Q=U_l$, the following equation holds:

$$F_{P,U_l,s_2}(t_2)=\begin{cases}\sqrt{\Phi\left(\frac{-\log l}{\sqrt{V(P)}}t_2\right)} & if\quad (\log l)t_2\leq s_2\\ 0 & if\quad otherwise\end{cases}\tag{51}$$

In particular, the above value is described by the limit of the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution



Fig. 10. The second-order rate region $\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{D}}_{P,U_l}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{M}}_{P,U_l}(s_1,t_1,\nu)$ when (s_1,t_1) is an admissible first-order rate pair.

function as follows:

$$F_{P,U_l,s_2}(t_2)=\sqrt{1-Z_{0,\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}}(t_2 D_{P,U_l})},$$

where $Z_{0,s}$ was defined in (12).

We give the proof of Lemma 28 in Section VII-T. When $Q=U_l$ and (s_1,t_1) is the admissible rate pair $(H(P),\frac{H(P)}{\log l})$, from Theorem 22 and Lemma 28, the second-order rate region is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{D}}_{P,U_l}(\nu)=\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{M}}_{P,U_l}(\nu)\\ &=\left\{(s_2,t_2)\,\middle|\,t_2\le\frac{\min\{s_2,-\sqrt{V(P)}\Phi^{-1}(\nu^2)\}}{\log l}\right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

The second-order rate region is illustrated as Fig. 10. Then the line with the slope $H(Q)^{-1}=(\log l)^{-1}$ is the set of semi-admissible rate pairs from Lemma 23 and the extreme point is the unique admissible pair.

V. Related topics

A. Random Number Compression

As a special case of RNC via restricted storage, we consider to regenerate a random number from P^n after compression of a random number from P^n into storage with size of $H(P)n+s_2\sqrt{n}$ bits. The process corresponds to RNC via restricted storage when $Q=P$ and $t_2=0$. Then, the optimal accuracy of random number compression is given by Theorems 5 and 26 as follows.

$$F_{P,P,s_2}(0)=\sqrt{\Phi\left(\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}\right)}.\tag{53}$$

Thus, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 29: Let P be any non-uniform probability distribution on a finite set. For random number compression with an accuracy ν, the minimum size of storage is represented by $H(P)n+\sqrt{V(P)\Phi^{-1}(\nu^2)}\sqrt{n}$.

Note that the purpose of the random number compression is not to recover the initial random number but to regenerate a random number subject to the same distribution P^n and the process itself differs from the data compression. However, the minimum size of storage in data compression has the same form with that of random number compression in Corollary 29 (see the equation (1) in [7]).



Fig. 11. The graph of the ratio $\frac{F_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2)}{F_{P,Q}(t_2)}$ with respect to the second-order rate s_2 of storage when $C_{P,Q} = V(P) = H(Q) = 1$. The left red line shows the case when $t_2 \le 0$. The middle blue and the right black lines show the cases when $t_2 = -3$ and $t_2 = -6$. In particular, the ratio of fidelities does not depend on t_2 if $t_2 \le 0$.

B. Relation with Conventional RNC

We have treated RNC via restricted storage. On the other hand, in the previous paper [12], we treated random number conversion without restriction of storage. Here, it is expected that the rate of the generated copies of the target distribution approaches to the conversion rate in the previous paper as the size of storage gets larger. In the following, we discuss this relation in terms of the asymptotic maximum fidelity of RNC.

When the first-order rate of the size of storage is the entropy of the source distribution, the asymptotic maximal fidelity in RNC with restricted storage is given as

$$F_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2) := F^{\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q}(s_2, t_2) = F^{\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q}(s_2, t_2). \tag{54}$$

On the other hand, the asymptotic maximal fidelity in RNC without restricted storage is given as follows shown in [12]

$$\begin{aligned} F_{P,Q}(t_2) &:= \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(P^n \to Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n + t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(P^n \to Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n + t_2\sqrt{n}}). \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Fig. 11 represents the graph of the ratio $F_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2)/F_{P,Q}(t_2)$ with respect to $s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ when $C_{P,Q} = 1$. We can read off that the value of $F_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2)$ converges to that of $F_{P,Q}(t_2)$ for each $t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ when s_2 goes to infinity and the existence of storage does not affect the accuracy (i.e. the asymptotic maximum fidelity) of RNC via restricted storage so much as long as the second-order rate is large enough even when the first-order rate strictly achieves the optimal value. In particular, when s_2 tends to infinity, the second order asymptotic expansion in Theorem 21 recovers Theorem 3 of [12] for RNC without restricted storage.

VI. Application to Quantum Information Theory

In this section, we apply the results of RNC via restricted storage for quantum information theory.

A. LOCC Conversion via Restricted Storage

When two distant parties perform some quantum protocol using a specific suitable entangled state (e.g. quantum tereportation, superdense coding, channel estimation), those parties need to prepare the entangled state by LOCC. Here, we consider the following two-step process. In the first part, an initial



Fig. 12. Process of entanglement compression by LOCC.

state is converted into the storage by LOCC. In the second part, the converted state is converted again to a target state by LOCC. We call such a process LOCC conversion via *entanglement storage*. In the following, let us represent the quantum system of entanglement storage by $\mathcal{H}_{qubit}^{\otimes N}$ where $\mathcal{H}_{qubit} := \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, and we analyze the asymptotic behavior of LOCC conversion of entanglement storage when an initial state and a target state are i.i.d. and pure.

We consider the maximam recovery number by LOCC:

$$\begin{aligned} &L_n^{\mathcal{Q}}(\psi, \phi|\nu, N) \\ &:= \max_{LOCC} \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N} \middle| \begin{array}{l} F(\Gamma_2 \circ \Gamma_1(\psi^{\otimes n}), \phi^{\otimes m}) \geq \nu, \\ \Gamma : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{qubit}^{\otimes N}), \\ \Gamma' : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{qubit}^{\otimes N}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}'^{\otimes m}) \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, note that the converted state in the entanglement storage is not necessarily pure, and thus, two-step process of LOCCs may not be simply represented by majorization conversion for the Schmidt coefficients of an initial state in general. Therefore, the results for majorization conversion of probability distributions can not be directly applied for the maximam recovery number by LOCC from its definition yet. To analyse the maximam recovery number, we introduce the maximum accuracy of LOCC conversion via entanglement storage as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &F^{\mathcal{Q}}(\psi \to \phi|N) \\ &:= \sup_{LOCC} \left\{ F(\Gamma' \circ \Gamma(\psi), \phi) \middle| \begin{array}{l} \Gamma : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{qubit}^{\otimes N}), \\ \Gamma' : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{qubit}^{\otimes N}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}') \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where ψ and ϕ are quantum states on bipartite systems $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}'$ respectively, $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is the set of all quantum states on $\mathcal{H}$ and the sup is taken over all pairs (Γ, Γ') of LOCC conversions. Then, we obtain

$$L_n^{\mathcal{Q}}(\psi, \phi|\nu, N) = \{m \in \mathbb{N} | F^{\mathcal{Q}}(\psi \to \phi|N) \geq \nu\} \tag{56}$$

by the definition. Moreover, the following lemma holds for the squared Schmidt coefficients P_ψ and P_ϕ of ψ and ϕ.

Lemma 30:

$$F^{\mathcal{Q}}(\psi \to \phi|N) = F^{\mathcal{M}}(P_\psi \to P_\phi|N) \tag{57}$$

We give the proof of Lemma 30 in Section VII-U. Here, we note that a converted state by LOCC in storage is not necessarily a pure state. However, in the optimal process, we can assume that the converted state by LOCC in storage is pure from the proof of Lemma 30. From (28), (56) and Lemma 30, the following proposition holds.

Proposition 31:

$$L_n^{\mathcal{Q}}(\psi, \phi|\nu, N) = L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P_\psi, P_\phi|\nu, N)$$

In particular, the asymptotic expansion of $L_n^{\mathcal{Q}}$ is obtained by Theorem 21.

Next, let us consider the rate regions of LOCC conversion via entanglement storage. For simplicity, we employ the following abbreviate notation:

$$F^{\mathcal{Q}}_{\psi,\phi,s_1}(t_1) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{Q}}\left(\psi^{\otimes n} \to \phi^{\otimes t_1 n\sqrt{n}} | s_1 n\right).$$

In order to treat the asymptotic relation between the second-order rates of storage and target entangled state, Then we define the second-order rate region as

$$\mathcal{R}^{1,\mathcal{Q}}_{\psi,\phi}(\nu) := \left\{ (s_1,t_1) \left| F^{\mathcal{Q}}_{\psi,\phi,s_1}(t_1) \ge \nu \right. \right\}.$$

Then, Lemma 30 and Theorem 16 implies the following theorem about first-order rate region.

Proposition 32: Let ψ and ϕ be pure entangled states on finite dimensional bipartite quantum systems. For $0 < s_1 \le S_\psi$, $s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu \in (0,1)$,

$$\mathcal{R}^{1,\mathcal{Q}}_{\psi,\phi}(\nu) = \mathcal{R}^{1,\mathcal{M}}_{P_\psi,P_\phi}(\nu).$$

Similarly, we employ the following abbreviate notation:

$$\begin{aligned} &F^{\mathcal{Q}}_{\psi,\phi,s_1,t_1,s_2}(t_2) \\ &:= \liminf_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{Q}}\left(\psi^{\otimes n} \to \phi^{\otimes t_1 n + t_2\sqrt{n}} | s_1 n + s_2\sqrt{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we define the second-order rate region as

$$\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{Q}}_{\psi,\phi}(s_1,t_1,\nu) := \left\{ (s_2,t_2) \left| F^{\mathcal{Q}}_{\psi,\phi,s_1,t_1,s_2}(t_2) \ge \nu \right. \right\}.$$

Then, Lemma 30 and Theorem 22 implies the following theorem about second-order rate regions.

Proposition 33: Let ψ and ϕ be pure entangled states on finite dimensional bipartite quantum systems. For $0 < s_1 \le S_\psi$, $s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\nu \in (0,1)$,

$$\mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{Q}}_{\psi,\phi}\left(s_1, \frac{s_1}{S_\phi}, \nu\right) = \mathcal{R}^{2,\mathcal{M}}_{P_\psi,P_\phi}\left(s_1, \frac{s_1}{H(P_\phi)}, \nu\right).$$

Therefore, the second-order rate region is obtained by Theorem 22. and is especially described by the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function at the semi-admissible rate pairs by Theorem 26.

B. Entangled State Compression by LOCC

In particular, when an initial state ϕ equals a target state ψ, the LOCC conversion via restricted entanglement storage is regarded as a compression process for entangled states. There already exist some studies about LOCC compression for entangled states. In particular, Schumacher [18] derived the optimal first-order rate of LOCC compression for entangled states in the framework of the first-order asymptotics. Here, we consider the LOCC compression in the framework of the second-order asymptotics and derive some observations which essentially can not be obtained from the first-order asymptotics. When the size of storage has the optimal first-order compression rate S_ψ and the second-order rate s_2, the difference between the numbers of the initial and recovered copies is given as

$$n - L_n(\psi,\psi|\nu,s_2) \cong -F^{-1}_{P_\psi,P_\psi,s_2}(\nu)\sqrt{n}, \tag{58}$$

where the concrete form of F_{P_ψ,P_ψ,s_2} was given in Themrem 26. The formula (58) relates with the irreversibility of entanglement concentration [11]. That is, when s_2 is smaller than $\sqrt{V(P_\psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\nu^2)$ for a required accuracy ν, the right-hand side in (58) is positive from Corollary 29 and represents the loss which inevitably occurs even in the optimal compression process. Moreover, from Lemma 9 and the proof of Lemma 30, the LOCC conversion in the optimal compression coincides with LOCC conversion used

in the optimal entanglement concentration. In addition, (58) also relates with LOCC cloning [12]. That is, when s_2 is larger than $\sqrt{V(P_\psi)}\Phi^{-1}(\nu^2)$, the right-hand side in (58) is negative from Corollary 29 and it represents that the number of copies of the recovered state after the compression process exceeds that of the initial state under the accuracy constraint. While we argued about approximate LOCC cloning without entanglement storage (or with infinite storage) in [12], the above fact says that approximate LOCC cloning can be realized even when there is entanglement storage with the tight first-order rate S_ψ as long as the second-order rate of the size of storage is large enough.

VII. Proofs of Theorems, Propositions and Lemmas

A. Proof of Lemma2

The existence of the unique solution of the equation (4) is equivalent to the existence of the unique zero point of the function

$$f(x) := (\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(x)) - (1-\Phi(x))\frac{N_{\mu,v}(x)}{N(x)}. \tag{59}$$

Since

$$\frac{df}{dx} = -\frac{d}{dx}\left(\frac{N_{\mu,v}}{N}\right)(1-\Phi), \tag{60}$$

the function f is strictly monotonically decreasing when $x < \frac{\mu}{1-v}$ and is strictly monotonically increasing when $x > \frac{\mu}{1-v}$. Since

$$\lim_{x\to-\infty} f(x) = \Phi_{\mu,v}(s) > 0, \tag{61}$$

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} f(x) = \Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - 1 < 0, \tag{62}$$

the function f has the unique zero point $\beta_{\mu,v,s} < \frac{\mu}{1-v}$ due to the intermediate value theorem. In addition, $\beta_{\mu,v,s} < s$ obviously holds because the left-hand side of (4) is negative for any $x > s$ although the right-hand side is always positive. ■

B. Proof of Lemma 3

The existence of the unique solution of the equation (4) is equivalent to the existence of the unique zero point of the function (59). Since

$$\frac{df}{dx} = -\mu\frac{N_{\mu,1}}{N}(1-\Phi), \tag{63}$$

the function f is strictly monotonically decreasing over $\mathbb{R}$ because of $\mu > 0$. Since f satisfies (61) and (62), the function f has the unique zero point $\beta_{\mu,v,s}$ due to the intermediate value theorem. In addition, $\beta_{\mu,v,s} < s$ obviously holds from the definition. ■

C. Proof of Lemma 4

There exists the unique solution of (6) with respect to x in Lemma 3 of [12]. Next, we show that there are two solutions $\beta'_{\mu,v} < \beta_{\mu,v}$ for the equation (4) and $\beta_{\mu,v}$ satisfies $\beta_{\mu,v} > \alpha_{\mu,v}$ under the condition $s > \Phi^{-1}_{\mu,v}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$. Here, the existence of the solutions is equivalent to the existence of the zero points of the function (59). Since f satisfies (60), the function f is strictly monotonically increasing when $x < \frac{\mu}{1-v}$ and is strictly monotonically decreasing $x > \frac{\mu}{1-v}$. Here, by the definition of $\alpha_{\mu,v}$ and the condition $s > \Phi^{-1}_{\mu,v}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$, we obtain the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha_{\mu,v}) &= \Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v}) \\ &\quad -(1-\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v}))\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})} > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x\to-\infty} f(x) &= -\infty, && (65)\\ \lim_{x\to\infty} f(x) &\le \lim_{x\to\infty}(\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)-\Phi_{\mu,v}(x)) \\ &= \Phi_{\mu,v}(s)-1<0, && (66)\end{aligned}$$

the function f has two zero points $\beta'_{\mu,v} < \beta_{\mu,v}$ and $\beta_{\mu,v} > \alpha_{\mu,v}$ due to the intermediate value theorem. In addition, $\beta_{\mu,v,s} < s$ obviously holds from the definition. ■

D. Lemmas for Direct Part of Theorem 5

The following lemma is given as Lemma 22 in [12].

Lemma 34: The ratio $\frac{N(x)}{N_{\mu,v}(x)}$ is strictly monotonically decreasing only on the interval $\mathcal{S}_{\mu,v}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mu,v} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{R} & \text{if } v=1 \text{ and } \mu>0 \\ \emptyset & \text{if } v=1 \text{ and } \mu\le 0 \\ (\frac{\mu}{1-v},\infty) & \text{if } v>1 \\ (-\infty,\frac{\mu}{1-v}) & \text{if } v<1, \end{cases} \tag{67}$$

where $\emptyset$ is the empty set.

Using $\beta_{\mu,v,s}$ and $\alpha_{\mu,v}$ in Lemmas 2, 3 and 4, we define a function $A_{\mu,v,s}:\mathbb{R}\to[0,1]$ which has different forms depending on $v>0$ as follows. When $v<1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &A_{\mu,v,s}(x) \\ &= \begin{cases} \Phi(x) & \text{if } x\le\beta_{\mu,v,s} \\ \Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s})+\frac{N(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}{N_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}(\Phi_{\mu,v}(x)-\Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})) & \\ & \text{if } \beta_{\mu,v,s}\le x\le s \\ 1 & \text{if } s\le x, \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

When $v=1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &A_{\mu,1,s}(x) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi_{\mu,1}(x)}{\Phi_{\mu,1}(s)} & \text{if } \mu\le 0, x\le s \\ \Phi(x) & \text{if } \mu>0, x\le\beta_{\mu,v,s} \\ \Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s})+\frac{N(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}{N_{\mu,1}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}(\Phi_{\mu,1}(x)-\Phi_{\mu,1}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})) & \\ & \text{if } \mu>0, \beta_{\mu,v,s}\le x\le s \\ 1 & \text{if } s\le x. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

When $v>1$ and $s\le\Phi^{-1}_{\mu,v}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$,

$$A_{\mu,v,s}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(x)}{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)} & \text{if } x\le s \\ 1 & \text{if } s\le x. \end{cases} \tag{68}$$

Wthen $v>1$ and $s\ge\Phi^{-1}_{\mu,v}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &A_{\mu,v,s}(x) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\Phi_{\mu,v}(x) & \text{if } x\le\alpha_{\mu,v} \\ \Phi(x) & \text{if } \alpha_{\mu,v}\le x\le\beta_{\mu,v,s} \\ \Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s})+\frac{N(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}{N_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}(\Phi_{\mu,v}(x)-\Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})) & \\ & \text{if } \beta_{\mu,v,s}\le x\le s \\ 1 & \text{if } s\le x. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 35: Suppose that $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v > 0$ satisfy $v < 1$, or $v = 1$ and $\mu > 0$, or $v > 1$ and $s > \Phi_{\mu,v}^{-1}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$. For an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, there exist real numbers $b \leq b'$ which satisfy the following condition ($\star$):
($\star$) There exist a and a' which satisfy the three conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathrm{I}) a \leq b \leq b' \leq a' \ and \ b' \leq s, \\
&(\mathrm{II}) \frac{\Phi(b)}{\Phi_{\mu,v}(b)} = \frac{N(a)}{N_{\mu,v}(a)} \ and \\
&\quad \frac{1-\Phi(b')}{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)-\Phi_{\mu,v}(b')} = \frac{N(a')}{N_{\mu,v}(a')}, \\
&(\mathrm{III}) \frac{N(x)}{N_{\mu,v}(x)} \ is \ monotonically \ decreasing \ on \ (a, a').
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Then such $b \leq b'$ satisfy the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\Phi(b)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(b)} + \int_b^{b'} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx \\
&+\sqrt{1-\Phi(b')}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)-\Phi_{\mu,v}(b')} \\
\leq \ & \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA_{\mu,v}}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right) + \epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Proof: First, we simultaneously treat the case when $v < 1$ and the case when $v = 1$ and $\mu > 0$. We take a constant $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies $\lambda < \beta_{\mu,v}$ and $\sqrt{\Phi(\lambda)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\lambda)} < \epsilon$. We verify that $b = \lambda$ and $b' = \beta_{\mu,v}$ satisfy the condition ($\star$) in the following. First, there exists a real number a such that $\frac{\Phi(\lambda)}{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\lambda)} = \frac{N(a)}{N_{\mu,v}(a)}$ and $a \leq \lambda$ by the mean value theorem. Moreover, since $\beta_{\mu,v}$ satisfies (4), $\beta_{\mu,v}$ can be taken as $a' = b'$. Thus, the conditions (I) and (II) in ($\star$) hold. Next, since $\frac{N(x)}{N_{\mu,v}(x)}$ is monotonically decreasing on $(\lambda, \beta_{\mu,v})$ from Lemma 2 and Lemma 34, the condition (III) in ($\star$) holds. Therefore, λ and $\beta_{\mu,v}$ satisfy the condition ($\star$). Then the following holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\Phi(\lambda)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\lambda)} + \int_\lambda^{\beta_{\mu,v}} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx \\
&+\sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta_{\mu,v})}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)-\Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v})} \\
\leq \ & \int_{-\infty}^{\beta_{\mu,v}} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx \\
&+\sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta_{\mu,v})}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)-\Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v})} + \epsilon, \\
= \ & \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA_{\mu,v}}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right) + \epsilon.
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Thus, the proof is completed for the case when $v < 1$ and the case when $v = 1$ and $\mu > 0$.

Next, we treat the case when $v > 1$ and $s > \Phi_{\mu,v}^{-1}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$. Then we can take as $a = b = \alpha_{\mu,v}$ and $a' = b' = \beta_{\mu,v,s}$ in ($\star$) from Lemma 4 and Lemma 34. Then the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})} + \int_{\alpha_{\mu,v}}^{\beta_{\mu,v,s}} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx \\
&+\sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)-\Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})} \\
=& \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA_{\mu,v}}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the proof is completed for the case when $v > 1$ and $s > \Phi_{\mu,v}^{-1}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$. ■

The following lemma is obvious.

Lemma 36: Suppose that $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v > 0$ satisfy $v = 1$ and $\mu \leq 0$, or $v > 1$ and $s \leq \Phi_{\mu,v}^{-1}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$. Then, the following equality holds

$$\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)} = \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA_{\mu,v}}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right). \tag{72}$$

E. Lemmas for Converse Part of Theorem 5

The following lemma is given as Lemma 15 of [12].

Lemma 37: Let $a = \{a_i\}_{i=0}^I$ and $b = \{b_i\}_{i=0}^I$ be probability distributions and satisfy $\frac{a_{i-1}}{b_{i-1}} > \frac{a_i}{b_i}$. When $c = \{c_i\}_{i=0}^I$ is a probability distribution and satisfies

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} a_k \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k} c_k \tag{73}$$

for any $k = 0, 1, ..., I$, the following holds:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{I} \sqrt{a_i}\sqrt{b_i} \geq \sum_{i=0}^{I} \sqrt{c_i}\sqrt{b_i}. \tag{74}$$

Moreover, the equation holds for c if and only if $c = a$.

Lemma 38: Suppose that $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v > 0$ satisfy $v < 1$, or $v = 1$ and $\mu > 0$, or $v > 1$ and $s > \Phi_{\mu,v}^{-1}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$. When real numbers $b \leq b'$ satisfy the condition ($\star$) in Lemma 35, the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_s} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right) \\
&\leq \sqrt{\Phi(b)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(b)} + \int_b^{b'} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx \\
&\quad + \sqrt{1 - \Phi(b')}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,b}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(b')}.
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

Proof: We set a sequence $\{x_i^I\}_{i=0}^I$ for $I \in \mathbb{N}$ as $x_i^I := b + \frac{b'-b}{I} i$. Then, we have the following for an arbitrary A in $\mathcal{A}_s$ defined in Definition 1:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right) \\
=&\int_{-\infty}^{b} \sqrt{\frac{dA}{dx}(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx + \int_{b'}^{s} \sqrt{\frac{dA}{dx}(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{I} \int_{x_{i-1}^I}^{x_i^I} \sqrt{\frac{dA}{dx}(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx \\
\leq&\sqrt{A(b)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(b)} + \sqrt{1-A(b')}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(b')} \qquad (76) \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sqrt{A(x_i^I) - A(x_{i-1}^I)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(x_i^I) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(x_{i-1}^I)} \\
\leq&\sqrt{\Phi(b)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(b)} + \sqrt{1-\Phi(b')}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(b')} \qquad (77) \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sqrt{\Phi(x_i^I) - \Phi(x_{i-1}^I)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(x_i^I) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(x_{i-1}^I)} \\
=&\sqrt{\Phi(b)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(b)} + \sqrt{1-\Phi(b')}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(b')} \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sqrt{\frac{\Phi(x_i^I) - \Phi(x_{i-1}^I)}{x_i^I - x_{i-1}^I}}\sqrt{\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(x_i^I) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(x_{i-1}^I)}{x_i^I - x_{i-1}^I}} \\
&\quad \times (x_i^I - x_{i-1}^I) \\
\overset{I\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}&\sqrt{\Phi(b)}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(b)} + \sqrt{1-\Phi(b')}\sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(b')} \\
&\quad + \int_b^{b'} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{\mu,v}(x)}dx
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality (76) is obtained from the Schwartz inequality and the inequality (77) is obtained from Lemmas 34 and 37. ■

The following lemma is obvious by the Schwartz inequality.

Lemma 39: Suppose that $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v > 0$ satisfy $v = 1$ and $\mu \leq 0$, or $v > 1$ and $s \leq \Phi_{\mu,v}^{-1}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$. Then, the following inequality holds

$$\sup_{A\in\mathcal{A}_s} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right) \leq \sqrt{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)}. \qquad (78)$$

F. Proof of of Theorem 5

Let $A_{\mu,v,s}$ be the function defined in Subsection VII-D. When $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v > 0$ satisfy $v < 1$, or $v = 1$ and $\mu > 0$, or $v > 1$ and $s > \Phi_{\mu,v}^{-1}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$, Lemmas 35 and 38 derives

$$\sup_{A\in\mathcal{A}_s} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right) = \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA_{\mu,v,s}}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right). \qquad (79)$$

Similarly, when $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v > 0$ satisfy $v = 1$ and $\mu \leq 0$, or $v > 1$ and $s \leq \Phi_{\mu,v}^{-1}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\mu,v}(\alpha_{\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\mu,v})}\right)$, Lemmas 36 and 39 derives (79). From the direct calculation for each case, we obtain the concrete form of the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution as in Theorem 5. ■

G. Proof of Proposition 6

First, we show that $Z_{v,s}(\mu)$ is monotonically increasing. We define a shift operator S_μ for a map $A : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $(S_\mu A)(x) := A(x-\mu)$. Then we have $\mathcal{F}(S_\mu p, S_\mu q) = \mathcal{F}(p,q)$. Thus when we define the set of functions $A : \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ as

$$\mathcal{A}_s(\mu) := \left\{ A \middle| \begin{array}{l} continuously\ differentiable\ monotone \\ increasing,\ A(s) = 1,\ \Phi_{\mu,1} \le A \le 1 \end{array} \right\},$$

we obtain the following form of the Rayleigh-normal distribution function

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{v,s}(\mu) &:= 1 - \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_s(0)} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{\mu,v}\right)^2 \\ &= 1 - \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_s(0)} \mathcal{F}\left(S_{-\mu}\frac{dA}{dx}, S_{-\mu}N_{\mu,v}\right)^2 \\ &= 1 - \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_s(0)} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{d(S_{-\mu}A)}{dx}, N_{0,v}\right)^2 \\ &= 1 - \sup_{\tilde{A} \in \mathcal{A}_{s-\mu}(-\mu)} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{d\tilde{A}}{dx}, N_{0,v}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

For $\mu < \tau$, $\mathcal{A}_{s-\mu}(-\mu) \supset \mathcal{A}_{s-\tau}(-\tau)$ holds, and thus we obtain $Z_v(\mu) \le Z_v(\tau)$.

Next we show $\lim_{\mu\to\infty} Z_{v,s}(\mu) = 1$. Since the Rayleigh-normal distribution function is a cumulative distribution function as was shown in [12], we have $\lim_{\mu\to\infty} Z_{v,s}(\mu) \ge \lim_{\mu\to\infty} Z_v(\mu) = 1$ from (3).

Next we show $\lim_{\mu\to-\infty} Z_v(\mu) = 0$. Since the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function is monotonically increasing, it is enough to show that for an arbitrary ϵ there exists μ_ϵ such that

$$\sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_s} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{\mu_\epsilon,v}\right) \ge 1 - \epsilon. \tag{80}$$

Let $M_\epsilon > 0$ be a real number such that $\Phi_{0,v}(M_\epsilon) - \Phi_{0,v}(-M_\epsilon) \ge 1 - \epsilon$. Then, it is easily verified that we can take μ_ϵ which satisfies $\mu_\epsilon + M_\epsilon < s$ and $\Phi_{\mu_\epsilon,v}(x) > \Phi(x)$ on $(\mu_\epsilon - M_\epsilon, \mu_\epsilon + M_\epsilon)$. Then it implies that there exists a function $A_\epsilon \in \mathcal{A}_s$ such that $A_\epsilon = \Phi_{\mu,v}$ on $(\mu_\epsilon - M_\epsilon, \mu_\epsilon + M_\epsilon)$. Thus, we obtain (80) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_s} \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{\mu_\epsilon,v}\right) &\ge \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA_\epsilon}{dx}, N_{\mu_\epsilon,v}\right) \\ &\ge \int_{\mu_\epsilon - M_\epsilon}^{\mu_\epsilon + M_\epsilon} N_{\mu_\epsilon,v} dx \\ &= \Phi_{0,v}(M_\epsilon) - \Phi_{0,v}(-M_\epsilon) \\ &\ge 1 - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show that $Z_{v,s}(\mu)$ is continuous. From Lemmas 2, 3, 4 and the implicit function theorem, $\alpha_{\mu,v}$ and $\beta_{\mu,v,s}$ are differentiable, especially continuous, with respect to μ. Thus, we can verify that $Z_v(\mu)$ is continuous from Theorem 5. ■

H. Proof of Proposition 7

From the definition of $I_{\mu,v}$,

$$0 \le \lim_{v\to 0} I_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s}) \le \lim_{v\to 0} I_{\mu,v}(\infty) = 0.$$

Thus, to derive $\lim_{v\to 0} Z_{v,s}(\mu)$, it is enough to evaluate $\lim_{v\to 0}\Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s})$, $\lim_{v\to 0}\Phi_{\mu,v}(s)$ and $\lim_{v\to 0}\Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})$ in (7).

First, we treat the case when $\mu > s$. Since

$$0 \leq \lim_{v\to\infty}\Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s}) \leq \lim_{v\to\infty}\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) = 0 \tag{81}$$

from (5) and the condition $\mu > s$, we obatian

$$\lim_{v\to 0} Z_{v,s}(\mu) = 1.$$

Next, we treat the case when $\mu \leq s$. Then we obtain the following equations as shown below:

$$\lim_{v\to 0}\Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s}) = \Phi(\mu), \tag{82}$$

$$\lim_{v\to 0}\Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s}) = 0. \tag{83}$$

First, we show (82). We have $\beta_{\mu,v,s} < \frac{\mu}{1-v}$ from Lemma 2. Since $\lim_{v\to 0}\frac{\mu}{1-v} = \mu$, we obtain $\limsup_{v\to 0}\beta_{\mu,v,s} \leq \mu$. Next, we set the function as

$$f_{\mu,v,s}(x) = (\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(x)) - (1-\Phi(x))\frac{N_{\mu,v}(x)}{N(x)} \tag{84}$$

and take an arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x < \mu$. Since $\lim_{v\to 0} N_{\mu,v}(x) = 0$, $\lim_{v\to 0}\Phi_{\mu,v}(x) = 0$, and

$$\lim_{v\to 0}\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & if \quad \mu < s \\ \frac{1}{2} & if \quad \mu = s, \end{cases} \tag{85}$$

the inequality $\lim_{v\to 0} f_{\mu,v,s}(x) = \lim_{v\to 0}\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) > 0$ holds. Therefore, x is not a zero point of $f_{\mu,v,s}$ when v is close to 0. Thus, we obtain $\lim_{v\to 0}\beta_{\mu,v,s} \geq \mu$ since $\beta_{\mu,v,s}$ is the unique zero point of $f_{\mu,v,s}$ by the definition. Therefore, $\lim_{v\to 0}\beta_{\mu,v,s} = \mu$ holds.

Then, we will show (83). In order to show it, it is enough to prove that $\lim_{v\to 0}\frac{\beta_{\mu,v,s}-\mu}{\sqrt{v}} = -\infty$ by the definition of $\Phi_{\mu,v}$. Since $\beta_{\mu,v,s} < \frac{\mu}{1-v}$ and $\lim_{v\to 0}\frac{\mu}{1-v} = \mu$, $\beta_{\mu,v,s}$ is bounded above by some constant γ as $\beta_{\mu,v,s} < \gamma$ when v is close to 0, and then, we have the following inequality:

$$\frac{N(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}{N_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})} = \frac{1-\Phi(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}{\Phi_{\mu,v}(s) - \Phi_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})} \geq \Phi(-\gamma). \tag{86}$$

Thus, the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\log\Phi(-\gamma) \\ \leq & 2\log\frac{N(\beta_{\mu,v,s})}{N_{\mu,v}(\beta_{\mu,v,s})} \\ = & (1-v)\left(\frac{\beta_{\mu,v,s} - \mu(1-v)^{-1}}{\sqrt{v}}\right)^2 + \log v - \frac{\mu^2}{1-v}. \end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{v\to 0}\left(\frac{\beta_{\mu,v,s} - \mu(1-v)^{-1}}{\sqrt{v}}\right)^2 = \infty. \tag{88}$$

Since Lemma 2 guarantees that $\beta_{\mu,v,s} < \frac{\mu}{1-v}$, we obtain

$$\lim_{v\to 0}\frac{\beta_{\mu,v,s} - \mu}{\sqrt{v}} = \lim_{v\to 0}\frac{\beta_{\mu,v,s} - \mu(1-v)^{-1}}{\sqrt{v}} = -\infty. \tag{89}$$

From (82), (83) and (85), we obatian

$$\lim_{v\to 0} Z_{v,s}(\mu) = \begin{cases} \Phi(\mu) & if \quad \mu < s \\ \frac{1}{2}(1+\Phi(\mu)) & if \quad \mu = s. \end{cases}$$

■

I. Proof of Proposition 8

From (9) of Theorem 5, the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function $Z_{v,\sqrt{v}s}(\sqrt{v}\mu)$ has two different forms depending on the sign of $s-\sqrt{v}^{-1}\Phi^{-1}_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}(\frac{\Phi_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}(\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v})})$. To analyze the sign in the limit $v\to\infty$, we first see the limiting behaviour of $\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}$. When $1<v$, the equation with respect to x

$$\frac{1-\Phi\left(x\right)}{1-\Phi_{\mu,1/v}(x)}=\frac{N(x)}{N_{\mu,1/v}(x)} \tag{90}$$

has the unique solution $\beta_{\mu,v,s}$ and the following equation holds [12]

$$\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}=\sqrt{v}(\mu-\beta_{\mu,1/v}). \tag{91}$$

Then, from the proof of Proposition 6 of [12],

$$\lim_{v\to\infty}\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v} = \lim_{v\to\infty}\sqrt{v}(\mu-\beta_{\mu,1/v})=\infty, \tag{92}$$

$$\lim_{v\to\infty}\frac{\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}}{\sqrt{v}} = \lim_{v\to\infty}\mu-\beta_{\mu,1/v}=0. \tag{93}$$

Then we have

$$\lim_{v\to\infty}\sqrt{v}^{-1}\Phi^{-1}_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}\left(\frac{\Phi_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}(\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v})}{\Phi(\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v})}\right)=0, \tag{94}$$

and thus, the form of the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function $Z_{v,\sqrt{v}s}(\sqrt{v}\mu)$ is determined according to the sign of s. When $s\le 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{v\to\infty}Z_{v,\sqrt{v}s}(\sqrt{v}\mu) &= \lim_{v\to\infty}1-\Phi_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}(\sqrt{v}s)\\ &= \Phi(\mu-s).\end{aligned}$$

Next we treat the case when $s>0$. From the inequality $\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}\le\beta_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v,\sqrt{v}s}$ of Lemma 4 and (92),

$$\lim_{v\to\infty}\Phi(\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v,\sqrt{v}s})=\lim_{v\to\infty}\Phi(\beta_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v,\sqrt{v}s})=1.$$

From (93),

$$\lim_{v\to\infty}\Phi_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v,\sqrt{v}s}(\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v})=\Phi(-\mu).$$

From the definition,

$$\lim_{v\to\infty}I_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}(\beta_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v,\sqrt{v}s})=\lim_{v\to\infty}I_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v}(\alpha_{\sqrt{v}\mu,v})=0.$$

Thus, when $s>0$,

$$\lim_{v\to\infty}Z_{v,\sqrt{v}s}(\sqrt{v}\mu)=\Phi(\mu).$$

■

J. Proof of Lemma 10

When we set as

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(P\to Q|M)\\ :=\ &\sup\left\{F(P'',Q)\middle|\ P\prec P'\prec P'', P'\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_M)\right\}\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{N}_M:=\{1,...,M\}$, it satisfies $F^{\mathcal{M}}(P\to Q|M)=\tilde{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(P\to Q|2^M)$. Thus, to prove Lemma 10, it is enough to show the equality

$$\tilde{F}^{\mathcal{M}}(P\to Q|M)=F^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{C}_M(P)\to Q). \tag{95}$$

Let $P'=(P'(1),...,P'(M))$ be an arbitrary probability distribution such that $P\prec P'$. To prove (95), it is enough to prove that $P_M\prec P'$. Here, we use the inductive method. When $M=1$, then (95) obviously holds for any probability distribution P. Let us assume that (95) holds for any P when $M=k-1$. In the following, we show that (95) holds for any P when $M=k$. When $J_{P,k}=1$, P_k equals U_k and satisfies $P_k=U_k\prec P'$. Let $J_{P,k}\geq 2$ in the following. Then, $P_k(1)=P(1)$.

When $P'(1)=P(1)$, $P^{\downarrow}|_{\{2,...,|\mathcal{X}|\}}\prec P'|_{\{2,...,M\}}$ holds since $P\prec P'$. By the assumption of the inductive method, $\frac{1}{C}P_k|_{\{2,...,|\mathcal{X}|\}}\prec\frac{1}{C'}P'_{\{2,...,M\}}$ where $C=\sum_{i=2}^{|\mathcal{X}|}P_k(i)$ and $C'=\sum_{i=1}^{M}P'(i)$ are normalizing constants. Thus, it follows that $P_k\prec P'$.

When $P'(1)>P(1)$, let $l_0:=\mathrm{argmax}\{l\in\{1,...,M\}|P'(1)=P'(l)\}$ and $\omega:=\sum_{l=1}^{l_0}(P'(l)-P(1))$. Moreover, we define the set K by $\{l\in\{1,...,M\}|P'(l)<P(l)\}=\{l_1,...,l_m\}$ where $l_i\leq l_{i+1}$ and determine $r_0\in K$ by the condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r_0-1}(P(l_i)-P'(l_i))<\omega\leq\sum_{i=1}^{r_0}(P(l_i)-P'(l_i)). \tag{96}$$

By using those notations, we set a probability distribution Q' by

$$Q'(l)=\begin{cases}P(1) & \textit{if } 1\leq l\leq l_0\\ P(l_i)-\epsilon & \textit{if } l=l_1,...,l_{r_0-1}\\ P'(l_{r_0})+\omega-\sum_{i=1}^{r_0-1}(P(l_i)-P'(l_i)) & \textit{if } l=l_{r_0}\\ P'(k) & otherwise.\end{cases}$$

Then, Q' satisfies $P\prec Q'\prec P'$ and $Q'(1)=P(1)$. As the same way as the case $P'(1)=P(1)$, $P_k\prec Q'$ holds. Since $Q'\prec P'$, $P_k\prec P'$ is derived. ■

K. Proof of Proposition 11

Let $m\geq n$. Then, the size of storage is greater than or equal to the size of support of the source distribution U_N^n, and thus the performances of deterministic (or majorization) conversions via storage and that without storage coincide with each other. Thus, we have

$$L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(U_N,Q|\nu,N^m) = L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(U_N,Q|\nu), \tag{97}$$
$$L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N,Q|\nu,N^m) = L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N,Q|\nu). \tag{98}$$

Next, let $m\leq n$. Then, U_N^m on the storage with size N^m can be converted from U_N^n by deterministic and majorization conversion. Thus, we have

$$L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(U_N,Q|\nu,N^m) \geq L_m^{\mathcal{D}}(U_N,Q|\nu), \tag{99}$$
$$L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N,Q|\nu,N^m) \geq L_m^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N,Q|\nu). \tag{100}$$

Moreover, since any probability distribution on a set with size N^m can be converted from U_N^n by majorization conversion. Therefore we have

$$L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N, Q|\nu, N^m) \leq L_m^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N, Q|\nu). \tag{101}$$

■

L. Proof of Proposition 12

When $m \geq L_n^i(P, U_N|\nu)$, the equation

$$L_n^i(P, U_N|\nu, m\log N) = L_n^i(P, U_N|\nu) \tag{102}$$

obviously holds by the definition.

Let $m \leq L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P, U_N|\nu)$. Since any probability distribution on a set with size N^m can be converted from U_N^n by majorization conversion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L_n^{\mathcal{D}}(P, U_N|\nu, m\log N) &\leq L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(P, U_N|\nu, m\log N) \\ &\leq L_n^{\mathcal{M}}(U_N^m, U_N|\nu) \\ &\leq m - 2\log_N \nu. \end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

where the first inequality follows from (21). ■

M. Proof of Lemma 14

Since $\{(S'_n, T'_n)\}$ is simulated by $\{(S_n, T_n)\}$, there exists a sequence of $0 < a_n \leq 1$ such that $S'_n = S_{a_n n}$ and $T'_n = T_{a_n n}$. From the ν-achievability of $\{(S_n, T_n)\}$, we have the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{m\to\infty} F^i(P^m \to Q^{T'_m}|S'_m) \\ = & \liminf_{m\to\infty} F^i(P^m \to Q^{T_{a_m m}}|S_{a_m m}) \\ = & \liminf_{m\to\infty} F^i(P^{\frac{n_m}{a_m}} \to Q^{T_{n_m}}|S_{n_m}) \\ \geq & \liminf_{m\to\infty} F^i(P^{n_m} \to Q^{T_{n_m}}|S_{n_m}) \\ \geq & \liminf_{n\to\infty} F^i(P^n \to Q^{T_n}|S_n) \\ \geq & \nu, \end{aligned}$$

where $n_m := a_m m$ and $i = \mathcal{D}$ or $\mathcal{M}$. ■

N. Proof of Theorem 16

First, we prove the direct part. Let $s_1 \geq H(P)$. From the results about the asymptotic maximal fidelity in [12], when ϵ is in $(0, 1/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(P^n \to Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n - n^{1/2+\epsilon}}|s_1 n) \\ \geq & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(U_2^{H(P)n - n^{1/2+\epsilon/2}} \to Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n - n^{1/2+\epsilon}}) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus, a first-order achievable rate t_1 satisfies $t_1 \geq \frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}$. Next, let $s_1 < H(P)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(P^n \to Q^{\frac{s_1}{H(Q)}n - n^{1/2+\epsilon}}|s_1 n) \\ \geq & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(U_2^{s_1 n} \to Q^{\frac{s_1}{H(Q)}n - n^{1/2+\epsilon}}) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus, a first-order achievable rate t_1 satisfies $t_1 \geq \frac{s_1}{H(Q)}$.

Then, we prove the converse part. Let $s_1 \geq H(P)$. From the results about the asymptotic maximal fidelity in [12], when ϵ is in $(0, 1/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(P^n \to Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+n^{1/2+\epsilon}}|s_1 n) \\ \leq & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(P^n \to Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+n^{1/2+\epsilon}}) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus, a first-order achievable rate t_1 satisfies $t_1 \leq \frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}$. Next, let $s_1 < H(P)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(P^n \to Q^{\frac{s_1}{H(Q)}n+n^{1/2+\epsilon}}|s_1 n) \\ \leq & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(U_2^{s_1 n} \to Q^{\frac{s_1}{H(Q)}n+n^{1/2+\epsilon}}) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus, a first-order achievable rate t_1 satisfies $t_1 \leq \frac{s_1}{H(Q)}$. ■

O. Proof of Lemma 23

First, we show the "only if" part. The condition that (s_2, t_2) simulates (s_2', t_2') is equivalent with the following by the definition: there exists $0 < a_n \leq 1$ such that

$$s_1(1-a_n)\sqrt{n} = s_2\sqrt{a_n} - s_2' + o(1), \tag{104}$$

$$t_1(1-a_n)\sqrt{n} = t_2\sqrt{a_n} - t_2' + o(1). \tag{105}$$

Then we obtain $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = 1$ by multiplying $1/\sqrt{n}$ on the both side of the equation (104) and taking the limit $n \to \infty$. In addition, we also obtain $s_2 \geq s_2'$ since $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = 1$ and the left-hand side of (104) is non-negative because of $a_n \leq 1$. Since (104) is equivalent with

$$t_1(1-a_n)\sqrt{n} = \frac{t_1}{s_1}(s_2\sqrt{a_n} - s_2') + o(1), \tag{106}$$

we obtain

$$t_2\sqrt{a_n} - t_2' + o(1) = \frac{t_1}{s_1}(s_2\sqrt{a_n} - s_2') + o(1). \tag{107}$$

Taking the limit $n \to \infty$, the equation (37) holds.

Next, we show the "if" part. We can give the concrete value of a_n from the quadratic equation with respect to $\sqrt{a_n}$:

$$t_1(1-a_n)\sqrt{n} = t_2\sqrt{a_n} - t_2'. \tag{108}$$

Then, the same $\sqrt{a_n}$ satisfies

$$s_1(1-a_n)\sqrt{n} = s_2\sqrt{a_n} - s_2', \tag{109}$$

from (37). Thus, the proof is completed. ■

P. Proof of Theorem 25

To prove Theorem 25, we prepare the following lemma which was given in the subsection 4.2 of [12].

Lemma 40: When P and Q are non-uniform distributions, the following equations hold for $i = \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty} F^i(U_2^n \to Q^{\frac{1}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}}) &= \sqrt{\Phi\left(-\frac{H(Q)^3 t_2}{\sqrt{V(Q)}}\right)},\\ \lim_{n\to\infty} F^i(P^n \to U_2^{H(P)n+t_2\sqrt{n}}) &= \sqrt{\Phi\left(-\frac{t_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}\right)}.\end{aligned}$$

The function $F_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}$ in (38) is obviously continuous and strictly monotonically decreasing on $F^{-1}_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}((0,1))$.

We first prove the direct part. Since $s_1 < H(P)$, the initial distribution can be converted to the uniform distribution with size of $s_1 n$ bits under the condition that asymptotic fidelity of conversion is 1 [12]. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}F^{\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2) &\ge \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(U_2^{s_1 n} \to Q^{\frac{s_1}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}})\\ &= F_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2),\end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 40. Next, we first prove the converse part. Since an arbitrary probability distribution on $\mathcal{B}_{s_1 n}$ can be converted from the uniform distribution with size of $s_1 n$ bits by majorization conversion. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}F^{\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2) &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(U_2^{s_1 n} \to Q^{\frac{s_1}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}})\\ &= F_{P,Q,s_1,\frac{s_1}{H(Q)},s_2}(t_2),\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 40. From (20), (110) and (111), we obtain (35). ■

Q. Proof of Direct Part of Theorem 26

We prove (47). It is enough to show the following inequality for arbitrary $A \in \mathcal{A}_{\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ by the definition of the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution function:

$$F^{\mathcal{D}}_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2) \ge \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{P,Q,t_2}\right) - \epsilon, \tag{112}$$

where $N_{P,Q,t_2} := N_{t_2 D_{P,Q}, C_{P,Q}}$.

Here, we choose $\lambda > 0$ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{(-\infty,-\lambda)\cup(\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}},\infty)} \sqrt{\frac{dA}{dx}(x)}\sqrt{N_{P,Q,b}(x)}dx\\ =\ &\int_{-\infty}^{-\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{dA}{dx}(x)}\sqrt{N_{P,Q,b}(x)}dx\\ \le\ &\epsilon,\end{aligned} \tag{113}$$

where the equation is obtained by athe condition $A(\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}) = 1$. Then, for $I \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \le i \le I$, we set sequences as

$$x_i^I := \sqrt{V(P)} \left(-\lambda + \frac{\frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}} - \lambda}{I} i \right). \tag{114}$$

Replacing x_i^I in the proof of Subsubsection $4.3.1$ in [12] by that defined in (114), we can obtain a sequence of deterministic maps W_n such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n\to\infty} F(W_n(P^{n\downarrow}), Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n + t_2\sqrt{n}\downarrow}) \\ \ge & \ \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{dA}{dx}, N_{P,Q,t_2}\right) - \epsilon \end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

and the size of image of W_n is less than $H(P)n + s_2\sqrt{n}$ bits. Since the left-hand side of (112) is larger than or equal to the left-hand side of (115) by the definition, we have (112). ■

R. Proof of Converse Part of Lemma 26

To prove the converse part, we prepare some lemmas. We abbreviate the normal distribution with specific parameters as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{P,Q,b} &:= \Phi_{bD_{P,Q},C_{P,Q}}, \\ N_{P,Q,b} &:= \frac{d\Phi_{P,Q,b}}{dx}. \end{aligned}$$

We set the subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ which depends on x and $x' \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} S_n^P(x) &:= \{1, 2, ..., \lceil 2^{H(P)n + x\sqrt{n}} \rceil\} \\ S_n^P(x, x') &:= S_n^P(x') \setminus S_n^P(x). \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is a part of Lemma 12 in [12].

Lemma 41: When both P and Q are non-uniform distributions,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n + b\sqrt{n}\downarrow}(S_n^P(x)) = \Phi_{P,Q,b}\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{V(P)}}\right).$$

The following is a modified version of Lemma 16 of [12].

Lemma 42: Suppose that real numbers $v \le v'$ satisfy the following condition ($\star$).

($\star$) There exist u and u' which satisfy the following three conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{I}) u \le v \le v' \le u' \ and \ v' \le s_2, \\ & (\mathrm{II}) \frac{\Phi(v)}{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(v)} = \frac{N(u)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(u)} \ and \\ & \qquad \frac{1 - \Phi(v')}{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(v')} = \frac{N(u')}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(u')}, \\ & (\mathrm{III}) \frac{N(x)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(x)} \ is \ monotonically \ decreasing \ on \ (u, u'). \end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

Then the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{P,Q,s_2}^{\mathcal{M}}(t_2) \\ & \le \sqrt{\Phi(v)}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(v)} + \int_v^{v'} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{P,Q,b}(x)}dx \\ & \quad + \sqrt{1 - \Phi(v')}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(v')}. \end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

Proof: Let P'_n be a probability distribution on $S_n^P(x)$ defined in (116) such that $P'_n \succ P_n$. When we set a sequence $\{x_i^I\}_{i=0}^I$ for $I \in \mathbb{N}$ as $x_i^I := v + \frac{v'-v}{I} i$, we have the following by the monotonicity of the fidelity [16]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(P_n'^{\downarrow}, Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}\downarrow}) \\
\le&\sqrt{P_n'^{\downarrow}(S_n^P(x_0^I))}\sqrt{Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}\downarrow}(S_n^P(x_0^I))} \\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\sqrt{P_n'^{\downarrow}(S_n^P(x_{i-1}^I, x_i^I))}\sqrt{Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}\downarrow}(S_n^P(x_{i-1}^I, x_i^I))} \\
&+\sqrt{P_n'^{\downarrow}(S_n^P(s_2)) - P_n'^{\downarrow}(S_n^P(x_I^I))} \\
&\quad\times\sqrt{Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}\downarrow}(S_n^P(s_2)) - Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}\downarrow}(S_n^P(x_I^I))} \\
&+\sqrt{1-P_n'^{\downarrow}(S_n^P(s_2))}\sqrt{1-Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}\downarrow}(S_n^P(s_2))}. \qquad (118)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we denote the right-hand side of (118) by $R_I(n)$. Then, we can choose a subsequence $\{n_l\}_l \subset \{n\}$ such that

$$\lim_{l\to\infty} R_I(n_l) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} R_I(n)$$

and the limits

$$\begin{aligned}
c_0 &:= \lim_{l\to\infty} P_{n_l}'^{\downarrow}(S_{n_l}(x_0^I)), \\
c_i &:= \lim_{l\to\infty} P_{n_l}'^{\downarrow}(S_{n_l}(x_{i-1}^I, x_i^I)), \\
c_{I+1} &:= \lim_{l\to\infty} \{P_{n_l}'^{\downarrow}(S_{n_l}(s_2)) - P_{n_l}'^{\downarrow}(S_{n_l}(x_I^I))\} \\
&= 1 - \lim_{l\to\infty} P_{n_l}'^{\downarrow}(S_{n_l}(x_I^I)) \\
c_{I+2} &:= 0
\end{aligned}$$

exist for $i = 1, \ldots, I$. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} F(P_n'^{\downarrow}, Q_n^{\downarrow}) \\
\le\ &\limsup_{n\to\infty} R_I(n) = \lim_{l\to\infty} R_I(n_l) \\
=\ &\sqrt{c_0}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_0)} \qquad (119) \\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{I}\sqrt{c_i}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_i^I) - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_{i-1}^I)} \\
&+\sqrt{c_{I+1}}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_I^I)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lamma 41 in the last equality.

When we set as

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &:= \Phi(x_0^I), \\ a_i &:= \Phi(x_i^I) - \Phi(x_{i-1}^I), \\ a_{I+1} &:= 1 - \Phi(x_I^I), \\ a_{I+2} &:= 0, \\ b_0 &:= \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_0), \\ b_i &:= \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_i^I) - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_{i-1}^I), \\ b_{I+1} &:= \Phi_{P,Q,b}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_I^I), \\ b_{I+2} &:= 1 - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(s_2) \end{aligned}$$

for $1, ..., I$, those satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 37 as follows. First, $a_0/b_0 = N(u)/N_{P,Q,t_2}(u)$ and $a_{I+1}/b_{I+1} = N(u')/N_{P,Q,t_2}(u')$ hold by the assumption (II). Moreover, there exist $z_i \in [x_{i-1}^I, x_i^I]$ for $i = 1, ..., I$ such that $a_i/b_i = N(z_i)/N_{P,Q,t_2}(z_i)$ for $i = 1, ..., I$ due to the mean value theorem. Then $z_i \in (u, u')$ holds because of the relation $v = x_0^I \leq x_{i-1}^I \leq z_i \leq x_i^I \leq x_I^I = v'$ and the assumption (I). Since $N(x)/N_{P,Q,t_2}(x)$ is monotonically decreasing on (u, u') by the assumption (III), we have $a_{i-1}/b_{i-1} \geq a_i/b_i$ for $i = 1, ..., I+1$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{k} a_i &= \Phi(x_k^I) \\ &= \lim_{l\to\infty} P^{n_l\downarrow}(S_{n_l}^P(x_k^I)) \\ &\leq \lim_{l\to\infty} P'^{\downarrow}_{n_l}(S_{n_l}^P(x_k^I)) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k} c_i \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

holds for $k = 0, 1, ..., I$ since $P^n \prec P'_n$, and $\sum_{i=0}^{I+1} a_i = 1 = \sum_{i=0}^{I+1} c_i$ holds.

From the above discussion, we can use Lemma 37. Therefore, the following hold:

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n\to\infty} F(P'^{\downarrow}_n, Q^{\downarrow}_n) \\ \leq\ & \sqrt{c_0}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_0^I)} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sqrt{c_i}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_i^I) - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_{i-1}^I)} \\ & + \sqrt{c_0}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_I^I)} \\ \leq\ & \sqrt{\Phi(v)}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(v)} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sqrt{\Phi(x_i^I) - \Phi(x_{i-1}^I)} \\ & \qquad \times \sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_i^I) - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_{i-1}^I)} \\ & + \sqrt{1 - \Phi(v')}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,b}(v')} \end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

where we used $x_0^I = v$ and $x_I^I = v'$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{I\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{I}\sqrt{\Phi(x_i^I)-\Phi(x_{i-1}^I)} \\
&\qquad\times\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_i^I)-\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_{i-1}^I)} \\
=\ &\lim_{I\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{I}\sqrt{\frac{\Phi(x_i^I)-\Phi(x_{i-1}^I)}{x_i^I-x_{i-1}^I}} \\
&\qquad\times\sqrt{\frac{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_i^I)-\Phi_{P,Q,b}(x_{i-1}^I)}{x_i^I-x_{i-1}^I}}(x_i^I-x_{i-1}^I) \\
=\ &\int_v^{v'}\sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{P,Q,b}(x)}dx,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} F(P_n'^{\downarrow}, Q_n^{\downarrow}) \\
\le\ &\sqrt{\Phi(v)}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(v)}+\int_v^{v'}\sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{P,Q,b}(x)}dx \\
&+\sqrt{1-\Phi(v')}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,b}(s_2)-\Phi_{P,Q,b}(v')}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

We treat the case when $v < 1$. Here, we use Lemma 42. For any $v \in \mathbb{R}$, the existence of u such that $u \le v$ and

$$\frac{\Phi(v)}{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(v)} = \frac{N(u)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(u)} \tag{122}$$

can be easily verified by the mean value theorem. Moreover, when we take as $u' = v' = \beta := \beta_{t_2 D_{P,Q}, C_{P,Q}, \frac{s_2}{\sqrt{V(P)}}}$, then $\beta \le s_2$ and

$$\frac{1-\Phi(\beta)}{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2)-\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)} = \frac{N(\beta)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)} \tag{123}$$

hold by Lemma 2. From Lemma 34, $\frac{N(u)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(u)}$ is monotonically decreasing on $(-\infty, \frac{bH(Q)}{1-C_{P,Q}})$. Since $\beta \le \frac{bH(Q)}{1-C_{P,Q}}$, thus (III) holds. Taking the limit $v \to -\infty$ in (117), we have the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&F_{P,Q,s_2}^{\mathcal{M}}(t_2) \\
\le\ &\int_{-\infty}^{\beta}\sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{P,Q,b}(x)}dx \\
&+\sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta)}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2)-\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)} \\
=\ &I_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta) \\
&+\sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta)}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2)-\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)}
\end{aligned}$$

and thus, the proof is completed.

Then, we treat the case when $v = 1$ First, we treat the case when $t_2 \le 0$. From (18),

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{P,Q,s_2}^{\mathcal{M}}(t_2) &\le \liminf_{n\to\infty}\sqrt{Q^{\frac{H(P)}{H(Q)}n+t_2\sqrt{n}\downarrow}(S_n^P(s_2))} \\
&= \sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 41 in the last equality. Next, we treat the case when $t_2 > 0$. Here, we use Lemma 42. For any $v \in \mathbb{R}$, the existence of u such that $u \le v$ and

$$\frac{\Phi(v)}{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(v)} = \frac{N(u)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(u)} \tag{124}$$

can be easily verified by the mean value theorem. Moreover, when we take as $u' = v' = \beta$, then $\beta \le s_2$ and

$$\frac{1-\Phi(\beta)}{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)} = \frac{N(\beta)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)} \tag{125}$$

hold by Lemma 3. From Lemma 34, $\frac{N(u)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(u)}$ is monotonically decreasing on $\mathbb{R}$, and thus (III) holds for any u and u'. Taking the limit $v \to -\infty$ in (117), we have the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & F^{\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2) \\ & \le \int_{-\infty}^{\beta} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{P,Q,b}(x)}dx \\ & \quad + \sqrt{1-\Phi(\beta)}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)}. \end{aligned} \tag{126}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{\beta} \sqrt{N(x)}\sqrt{N_{P,Q,b}(x)}dx \\ = \; & \Phi\left(\beta - \frac{D_{P,Q}t_2}{2}\right) e^{-\frac{(D_{P,Q}t_2)^2}{8}}, \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

the proof is completed.

Then, we treat the case when $v > 1$. At first, we treat the case when $s_2 \le \Phi^{-1}_{P,Q,t_2}\left(\frac{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\alpha)}{\Phi_P(\alpha)}\right)$, where $\alpha := \alpha_{t_2 D_{P,Q}, C_{P,Q}}$. For an arbitrary sequence $\{P'_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of probability distributions which satisfies $P'_n \succ P^n_{2^{H(P)n+s_2\sqrt{n}}}$, the monotonicity of the fidelity follows

$$\begin{aligned} F(P'_n, Q_n) \; \le \; & \sqrt{P'_n(S^P_n(s_2))}\sqrt{Q_n(S^P_n(s_2))} \\ & + \sqrt{P'_n(S^P_n(s_2,\infty))}\sqrt{Q_n(S^P_n(s_2,\infty))}. \end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

Since

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} P'_n(S^P_n(s_2,\infty)) = 0, \tag{129}$$

we obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} F(P'_n, Q_n) \le \sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2)}. \tag{130}$$

Next, we treat the case when $s_2 > \Phi^{-1}_{P,Q,t_2}\left(\frac{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\alpha)}{\Phi_P(\alpha)}\right)$. Here, we use Lemma 42. By Lemma 4, α satisfies

$$\frac{\Phi(\alpha)}{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\alpha)} = \frac{N(\alpha)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(\alpha)}, \tag{131}$$

and β satisfies

$$\frac{1-\Phi(\beta)}{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)} = \frac{N(\beta)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)}. \tag{132}$$

When we take as $u = u' = \alpha$ and $v = v' = \beta$ in Lemma 42, those satisfy (I) and (II). Moreover, from Lemma 34, $\frac{N(u)}{N_{P,Q,t_2}(u)}$ is monotonically decreasing on $(\frac{bH(Q)}{1-C_{P,Q}}, \infty)$. Since $\frac{bH(Q)}{1-C_{P,Q}} \le \alpha \le \beta$, (III) holds. Thus, we have the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & F^{\mathcal{M}}_{P,Q,s_2}(t_2) \\ \le & \sqrt{\Phi_P(\alpha)\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\alpha)} + (I_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta) - I_{P,Q,t_2}(\alpha)) \\ & + \sqrt{1-\Phi_P(\beta)}\sqrt{\Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(s_2) - \Phi_{P,Q,t_2}(\beta)}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus, the proof is completed. ■

S. Proof of Theorem 27

The function F_{U_l,Q,s_2} in (49) is obviously continuous and strictly monotonically decreasing on $F^{-1}_{U_l,Q,s_2}((0,1))$.

We first prove the direct part. Let $s_2 \ge 0$. Since the size of storage is greater than the size of support of U_l^n, U_l^n can be converted to U_l^n itself in storage. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\mathcal{D}}_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2) &\ge \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(U_l^n \to Q^{\frac{\log l}{H(Q)}n + t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= F_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2), \end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 40. Next, let $s_2 < 0$. U_l^n can be converted to $U_2^{(\log l)n + s_2\sqrt{n}}$ under the condition that asymptotic fidelity of conversion is 1. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\mathcal{D}}_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2) &\ge \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(U_2^{(\log l)n + s_2\sqrt{n}} \to Q^{\frac{\log l}{H(Q)}n + t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= F_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2). \end{aligned} \tag{134}$$

Then, we prove the converse part. Let $s_2 \ge 0$. Then, the following inequality obviously holds

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\mathcal{M}}_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2) &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(U_l^n \to Q^{\frac{\log l}{H(Q)}n + t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= F_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2). \end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

Next, let $s_2 < 0$. Since an arbitrary probability distribution on $S_n^P(s_2)$ defined in (116) can be converted from the uniform distribution with size of $(\log l)n + s_2\sqrt{n}$ bits by majorization conversion. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\mathcal{M}}_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2) &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(U_2^{(\log l)n + s_2\sqrt{n}} \to Q^{\frac{\log l}{H(Q)}n + t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= F_{U_l,Q,s_2}(t_2). \end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

From (20), (133), (134), (135) and (136), we obtain (35). ■

T. Proof of Theorem 28

The function F_{P,U_l,s_2} in (51) is obviously continuous and strictly monotonically decreasing on $F^{-1}_{P,U_l,s_2}((0,1))$.

We first prove the direct part. Let $(\log l)t_2 \le s_2$. Since the size of storage is greater than the size of support of $U_l^{\frac{H(P)}{\log l}n + t_2\sqrt{n}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\mathcal{D}}_{P,U_l,s_2}(t_2) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(P^n \to U_l^{\frac{H(P)}{\log l}n + t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(P^n \to U_2^{H(P)n + (\log l)t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= F_{P,U_l,s_2}(t_2). \end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

When $(\log l)t_2 > s_2$, the direct part is obvious from Lemma 40.

Next, we prove the converse part. Let $(\log l)t_2 \le s_2$. Then, the following inequality obviously holds

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\mathcal{M}}_{P,U_l,s_2}(t_2) &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(P^n \to U_l^{\frac{H(P)}{\log l}n+t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{D}}(P^n \to U_2^{H(P)n+(\log l)t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ &= F_{P,U_l,s_2}(t_2). \end{aligned} \tag{138}$$

Let $(\log l)t_2 > s_2$. Since an arbitrary probability distribution on $S_n^P(s_2)$ can be converted from the uniform distribution with size of $H(P)n + s_2\sqrt{n}$ bits by majorization conversion. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & F^{\mathcal{M}}_{P,U_l,s_2}(t_2) \\ \le & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(U_2^{H(P)n+s_2\sqrt{n}} \to U_l^{\frac{H(P)}{\log l}n+t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ = & \lim_{n\to\infty} F^{\mathcal{M}}(U_2^{H(P)n+s_2\sqrt{n}} \to U_2^{H(P)n+(\log l)t_2\sqrt{n}}) \\ = & 0. \end{aligned} \tag{139}$$

From (20), (137), (138) and (139), we obtain (35). ■

U. Proof of Lemma 30

Let ψ_M be a pure state on $\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^M$ with the suquared Schmidt coefficient $\mathcal{C}_M(P_\psi)$ defined in (22). Then, according to Lemma 10, an arbitrary pure state on $\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^M$ which can be converted from ψ by LOCC can also be converted from ψ via ψ_M by LOCC. Thus, if we convert ψ to ψ_M in the first step, the minimal error is attainable in the second step. Here, ψ_M was given when the optimal entanglement concentration was performed for ψ and does not depend on ϕ. Therefore, it is optimal to perform the entanglement concentration as LOCC in the first step and especially the optimal operation does not depend on ϕ.

Lemma 43: Let ψ be a pure state on a bipartite system $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. Then, there exists a LOCC map $\Gamma : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^M)$ which satisfies the following conditions:

(I) $\Gamma(\psi) = \psi_M$,

(II) For any LOCC map $\Gamma' : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^M)$, there exists a LOCC map $\tilde{\Gamma} : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^M) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^M)$ such that $\Gamma'(\psi) = \tilde{\Gamma}(\psi_M)$.

Proof: Because of Nielsen's theorem [15], there exists a LOCC map Γ which satisfies (I). Next, we prove that such Γ satisfies (II). Let a LOCC map $\Gamma' : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^M \otimes \mathbb{C}^M)$ output a state η_j with probability q_j. Then, because of Jonathan-Plenio's theorem [10],

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} P_\psi^\downarrow(i) \le \sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_j q_j P_{\eta_j}^\downarrow(i) \tag{140}$$

holds for any $l = 1, ..., M$. Since $\mathcal{C}_M(P_\psi)(i) = P_\psi^\downarrow(i)$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{C}_M(P_\psi)(i) \le \sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_j q_j P_{\eta_j}^\downarrow(i) \tag{141}$$

for any $l = 1, ..., J_{P_\psi,M}$ where $J_{P_\psi,M}$ was defined in (23). Moreover, (141) holds for any $l = J_{P_\psi,M} + 1, ..., M$. If it does not holds, it is a contradiction as follows. Then, there are the minimum numbers

$k_0, l_0 \in \{J_{P_\psi,M}+1, ..., M\}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_0} \mathcal{C}_M(P_\psi)(i) > \sum_{i=1}^{k_0} \sum_j q_j P^{\downarrow}_{\eta_j}(i), \tag{142}$$

$$\frac{\sum_{i=J_{P_\psi,M}+1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} P^{\downarrow}_{\psi}(i)}{M - J_{P_\psi,M}} > \sum_j q_j P^{\downarrow}_{\eta_j}(l_0). \tag{143}$$

and $k_0 \geq l_0$. Moreover, the inequality (143) holds for any $l \geq l_0$ because $\sum_j q_j P^{\downarrow}_{\eta_j}(l)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to l. Thus, we have the following contradiction.

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^{k_0} \mathcal{C}_M(P_\psi)(i) + \sum_{i=k_0+1}^{M} \mathcal{C}_M(P_\psi)(i) \tag{144}$$

$$> \sum_{i=1}^{k_0} \sum_j q_j P^{\downarrow}_{\eta_j}(i) + \sum_{i=k_0+1}^{M} \sum_j q_j P^{\downarrow}_{\eta_j}(i) \tag{145}$$

$$= 1. \tag{146}$$

As proved above, (141) holds for any $l = 1, ..., M$, and thus, we obtain (II) because of Jonathan-Plenio's theorem [10]. ■

From Lemma 43 with $M = 2^N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\mathcal{Q}}(\psi \to \phi|N) &= F^{\mathcal{Q}}(\psi_{2^N} \to \phi) \\ &= F^{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{C}_{2^N}(P_\psi) \to P_\phi) \\ &= F^{\mathcal{M}}(P_\psi \to P_\phi|N). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the proof is completed. ■

VIII. Conclusion

We have considered random number conversion (RNC) via random number storage with restricted size. In particular, we derived the rate regions between the storage size and the conversion rate of RNC from the viewpoint of the first- and second-order asymptotics. In the first-order rate region, it was shown that there exists the trade-off when the rate of storage size is smaller than or equal to the entropy of the initial distribution as in Fig. 4 and semi-admissible rate pairs characterize the trade-off. When RNC achieves a semi-admissible first-order rate pair, the non-trivial second-order rate regions were obtained as in Figs. 5, 8, 7, 9 and 10. Especially, to derive the second-order rate at a semi-admissible rate pairs, we introduced the generalized Rayleigh-normal distribution and investigate its basic properties. From the second-order asymptotics, we also obtained asymptotic expansion of maximum generation number with high approximation accuracy. Then, we applied the results for probability distributions to an LOCC conversion via entanglement storage problem of pure states in quantum information theory. In the problem, we did not assume that an initial state and a target state are the same states, However, the LOCC conversion via storage can be regarded as compression process if the target state equals the initial state, and thus, our problem setting is a kind of generalization of LOCC compression for pure states.

Here, we give some special remarks on the admissibility of rate pairs. In the argument to characterization of the rate regions, we defined the simple relations called "better" and "simulate" between two rate pairs, and introduced the admissibility of rate pairs based on the relations in order to clarify essentially important rate pairs in the rate region. The admissible rate pairs can determine whether a rate pair is in the rate region. That is, for any rate pair in the rate region, there is an admissible rate pair such that the admissible rate pair simulates or is better than the rate pair. On the other hand, an arbitrary rate pair not having such an admissible pair is not contained in the rate region. Thus, the admissible rate pairs uniquely determine

the whole of rate region although those are a subset of the boundary of the rate region. Moreover, since any admissible rate pair does not simulate or is not better than another admissible one, a proper subset of the admissible rate pairs can not determine the rate region as above. In the sense, the admissible rate pairs can be regarded as the "minimal generator" of the rate region, and hence, are of special importance in the rate pairs. To characterize the rate region, the above discussion tells us the importance of the characterization of the semi-admissible rate pairs. In the first order case, the characterization can be obtained by the interval between the specific point and the origin. However, in the second order case, it is not so trivial and has been obtained as Lemma 23 in this paper first time. The characterization is related to the first order of the specific point as well.

We note that, besides RNC via restricted storage, the notion of "simulate" was implicitly appeared in asymmetric information theoretic operations. For instance, Fig. 1 in [4] represents the typical first-order rate region in the wiretap channel Then the left side boundary of the region is characterized as an interval between the origin and the other edge point, and hence, the left side boundary is simulated by the edge point of the interval. Besides of such an applicability of "simulate", the notion of "simulate" has not been focused on, and thus, the admissibility in the sense of this paper has not been recognized. In particular, to our knowledge, it has not been appeared in the context of the second-order rate region in existing studies. Since the notion of "simulate" plays an important role in the characterization of the rate region, it will be widely used also in the rate region in the sense of the first and second order.

We refer some future studies. First, probability distributions or quantum states were assumed to be i.i.d. in this paper. To treat information sources with classical or quantum correlation, the extension from an i.i.d. sequence to general one is thought as a problem to be solved [14]. Second, we analyzed only the asymptotic performance of random number conversion and LOCC conversion. On the other hand, what we can operate has only finite size. Therefore, it is expected that conversion via restricted storage are analyzed in finite setting. Third, since only pure states were treated in quantum information setting although mixed entangled states can be appear in practice, the extension from pure states to mixed states is thought to be important. Finally, we have shown that the problem of RNC via restricted storage has a non-trivial trade-off relation described by the second-order rate region although trade-off relation in the first-order rate region is quite simple. As is suggested by the results, even when two kinds of first-order rates in an information theoretical problem simply and straightforward relate with each other, there is a possibility that the rate region has a non-trivial trade-off relation in the second order asymptotics. We can conclude that consideration of the second order asymptotics might bring a new trade-off relation in various information theoretical problems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

WK was partially supported from Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows No. 233283. MH is partially supported by a MEXT Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) No. 23246071 and the National Institute of Information and Communication Technology (NICT), Japan. The Centre for Quantum Technologies is funded by the Singapore Ministry of Education and the National Research Foundation as part of the Research Centres of Excellence programme.

REFERENCES

[1] B. C. Arnold, *Majorization and the Lorenz Order: A Brief Introduction*, Springer-Verlag, (1986).
[2] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, "Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations," Phys. Rev. A, **53**, 2046, (1996).
[3] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin, A. V. Thapliyal, "Exact and asymptotic measures of multipartite pure-state entanglement," Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012307 (2000).
[4] I. Csiszár, J. Korner, "Broadcast channels with confidential messages," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **24(3)**, 339-348, (1978).
[5] A. W. Harrow, H. K. Lo, "A tight lower bound on the classical communication cost of entanglement dilution," Information Theory, IEEE Transactions, **50**, 319-327, (2004).
[6] M. Hayashi, "General formulas for fixed-length quantum entanglement concentration," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **52**, 1904-1921, (2006).

[7] M. Hayashi, "Second-order asymptotics in fixed-length source coding and intrinsic randomness," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **54**, 4619-4637, (2008).

[8] M. Hayashi, M. Koashi, K. Matsumoto, F. Morikoshi, A. Winter, "Error exponents for entanglement concentration," J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **36**, 527 (2003).

[9] P. Hayden, A. Winter, "Communication cost of entanglement transformations," Phys. Rev. A , **67(1)**, 012326, (2003).

[10] D. Jonathan, M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1455 (1999).

[11] W. Kumagai, M. Hayashi, "Entanglement Concentration is Irreversible," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111(13)**, 130407, (2013).

[12] W. Kumagai, M. Hayashi, "A New Family of Probability Distributions and Asymptotics of Classical and LOCC Conversions," arXiv:1306.4166, (2013); The conference version of this paper is appeared in ISIT2014, IEEE International Symposium on (pp. 2047-2051).

[13] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*, Academic Press, New York, (1979).

[14] K. Modi, T. Paterek, W. Son, V. Vedral, and M. Williamson, "Unified view of quantum and classical correlations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501, (2010).

[15] M. A. Nielsen, "Conditions for a class of entanglement transformations. Physical Review Letters," Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 436 (1999).

[16] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (2000).

[17] R. Nomura, T. S. Han, "Second-order resolvability, intrinsic randomness, and fixed-length source coding for mixed sources: Information spectrum approach," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **59**, 1-16, (2013).

[18] B. Schumacher, "Quantum coding," Phys. Rev. A, **51(4)**, 2738, (1995).

[19] V. Y. Tan, O. Kosut, "On the dispersions of three network information theory problems," 2012 46th Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS), 1-6, (2012).

[20] A. W. Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*, Cambridge University Press, (1998).

[21] S. Vembu, S. Verdú, "Generating random bits from an arbitrary source: fundamental limits," IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **41**, 1322-1332, (1995).

[22] G. Vidal, D. Jonathan, M. A. Nielsen, "Approximate transformations and robust manipulation of bipartite pure-state entanglement," Phys. Rev. A **62**, 012304, (2000).

[23] S. Watanabe, S. Kuzuoka, V. Y. Tan, "Non-Asymptotic and Second-Order Achievability Bounds for Coding With Side-Information," arXiv:1301.6467, (2013).